



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY



AH 3RVZ .



Period
1016

Harvard Divinity School



**ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

MDCCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

Period
1016

Harvard Divinity School



**ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY**

MDCCCCX

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

LARD'S
QUARTERLY,

DEVOTED TO THE
PROPAGATION AND DEFENSE OF THE GOSPEL.

~~~~~  
**BY MOSES E. LARD.**  
~~~~~

VOLUME IV.

LEXINGTON, KY.

—
1867.

Published
by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
600 North Rossmore
Hollywood 4, California

Period
1016
v. 4

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.
INDEX.

	PAGE.
PAUL'S ALLEGORY OF THE OLIVE-TREE. J. M. LONG.....	1
THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL IN THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER.	
I. B. GRUBBS.....	22
BRUCE VANCE'S EXPERIENCE.....	32
PRAYER. DAVID WALK.....	46
ODDS AND ENDS. THOMAS MUNNELL.....	56
THE THREE MODES. L. B. WILKES.....	64
EMANATION AND CHARACTER OF HUMAN SPIRITS—REPLY.....	73
HOW CAN IT GET IT?.....	80
SCRIPTURE TYPES—No. 3. ROBERT GRAHAM.....	95
ATTITUDE IN PRAYER—COMMENTS.....	100
1866.....	110
WHAT IS RELIGION?— <i>Poetry</i>	112
THE EDITOR'S THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM. E. E. ORVIS.....	113
UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE. L. B. WILKES.....	125
THE TWO ASPECTS OF FAITH AS PRESENTED IN HEBREWS XI., 1. J. M. LONG.....	129
WAR. G. W. ABLE.....	139
A FEW WORDS ON MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.....	149
THE FAMILY OF JUDAH. J. W. MCGARVEY.....	157
LECTURE ON THE PENTATEUCH, BY A. CAMPBELL.....	165
THE COMMISSION. F. W. EMMONS.....	166
ECCE HOMO.....	180
DELAY OF THE PRESENT NUMBER—EXPLANATION.....	224
FAITH—ITS DEFINITION.....	225
THY KINGDOM COME. DAVID WALK.....	240
OUR MODE OF PREACHING.....	253
EFFICACY OF THE ATONEMENT. I. B. GRUBBS.....	264
THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.....	273
PATTERSON INSTITUTE, AT NORTH MIDDLETOWN, KY.....	285
FAIRS AND THEIR EFFECTS.....	286
THE EDITOR ON MIRACLES, SECUNDUM HINSDALE.....	292
O. ON THE EDITOR'S THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM. E. E. ORVIS.....	303
MODERN PHILANTHROPY. MRS. J. D. PICKETT.....	324
OUR PRESENT POSITION AND FUTURE DUTIES.....	337
ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES OF CHRIST. DR. H. CHRISTOPHER.....	349
O.'S THEORY IN REGARD TO THE MILLENNIUM. E. E. ORVIS.....	369
IT IS THE POWER. L. B. WILKES.....	381
THE TRUE WORSHIP OF GOD.....	391
DR. BROADDUS ON BAPTISM FOR REMISSION OF SINS. J. W. MCGARVEY.....	403
THE NEW BIRTH. I. B. GRUBBS.....	416
ELDER GOSS—KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA CAMPBELLITES.....	427
REASON AND REVELATION.....	434
ROMANISM AND THE CONFSSIONAL. DAVID KING.....	444

General

Went

85-8-1

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

JANUARY, 1867.

No. 1.

PAUL'S ALLEGORY OF THE OLIVE-TREE.

1. "SHALL the subject of the olive-tree, now that it is in hand, not receive an exhausting notice?" Inasmuch as there has appeared, as yet, no response to this request of the editor of the *Quarterly*, made in Vol. II., No. 3, we hope that a reinvestigation of the subject will not be deemed out of place at this time. When we consider that one of the most plausible arguments ever urged before a popular audience in favor of infant church-membership is based upon the interpretation which the advocates of that doctrine give to Paul's figure of the olive-tree, and that no device of Popery has done so much to corrupt the church, to prevent the progress of the gospel, and to hinder the union and co-operation of Christians, as the doctrine thus sought to be sustained, the importance of a thorough and exhaustive elucidation of this subject can not be over-estimated. In order that the issue may be fully and fairly brought before us, we will quote this much-mooted passage, and then state the pedobaptist argument based upon it.

"For if the first-fruit be holy, the lump is also holy ; and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear ; for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God : on them who fell, severity ; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in ; for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree, how much

more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree." (Rom. xi., 16-25.)

Confidently believing the pedobaptist argument based upon this passage to be a sophism, and that it can be fully refuted and exposed to the entire conviction of any intelligent reader, we will now state it, without abating aught from its strength, in order that we may not appear in our effort at a refutation to be beating the air. This we will do in the language of one of the most learned and able men of the opposite side. "The church of God is the same in all ages, and under all dispensations. It is the society of the true people of God, together with their children. To this society the ancient patriarchs and their posterity belonged; into this society, at the time of Christ, other nations were admitted, and the great body of the Jews were cast out; and into this same community the ancient people of God are to be again received. In every stage of its progress, the church is the same. The olive-tree is one, though the branches are numerous, and sometimes changed." (Hodge's *Commentary on Romans*.)

The position here maintained by this author is, as we see, in the form of a conclusion, drawn from his previous interpretation of the olive-tree. This we are told, represents the church of God, that the Jews, with their infant children, before Christ, were branches in this tree, or members of the church; that at the beginning of the gospel age the trunk of the olive-tree was still left standing, or, in literal language, the church remained the same identical institution, only the unbelieving Jews, as branches, were "broken off," or excluded from the church, while those who received the Messiah still maintained their former relation to the olive-tree, or remained in the church, and that the believing Gentiles "were grafted in among" the faithful Jews, or became members of the same church, and with them were made joint partakers "of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." From this interpretation the conclusion is drawn, with an air of the greatest assurance, that the Jewish theocracy was merged in the kingdom of Christ, that the latter is but an elevation and enlargement of the former, and that while its name and circumstances were changed, and many of its members cast out and others introduced, it still remains the same identical institution; and that since infants, as well as their parents, were entitled to membership in the church before Christ, it follows, incontrovertibly, that they are still entitled to such membership, the gospel dispensation not in the least affecting their relation to the church.

We have taken considerable pains to state this argument in its full strength, not only for the sake of fairness, but also because we feel confident that, though plausible and specious in the highest degree, it can be thoroughly refuted. No argument has ever been urged be-

fore a popular audience in support of infant church-membership with such a color of plausibility as this. To those who are wedded to the darling rite of infant baptism, such reasonings are "confirmations strong as holy writ." They regard the argument as final, conclusive; as deciding the whole controversy in their own favor. While those of our own party in this controversy, who have broken lances with our pedobaptist knights, have felt that the whole thing is a sophism; yet it is but the part of candor to confess that they all have experienced considerable difficulty in furnishing an explanation of the passage in question which might destroy the force of the pedobaptist argument and at the same time be received as the true solution.

2. Every false argument may be answered and refuted in one or both of two ways: first, by establishing a counter-argument, which clearly proves the negative of the proposition sought to be sustained; second, by showing either that the premises are defective, or that the conclusion does not legitimately follow. If, therefore, we shall succeed in carrying this pedobaptist stronghold by both these methods, every candid person will admit that the argument has been doubly refuted, and that, consequently, the doctrine thus sought to be sustained ought at once to be given up as false and unscriptural.

What, then, is the proposition claimed to be proved by the olive-tree? It is that the old Jewish commonwealth and the church of Christ are identical. Now, if any proposition can be clearly established from the Bible, it is precisely the opposite of this. One of the most important rules of biblical criticism is that no interpretation of any passage of Scripture shall be given which contradicts the plain and express teaching of God's word in other places. This is one of the safest and soundest rules we can follow in all controverted questions, and is well expressed in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith (chap. i., sec. 9): "The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and false sense of any scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly." This important rule demands of us that if the passage in question is figurative, it must be explained by the literal; if it is obscure and difficult, it must be made to harmonize with those plain and easy passages about which there can be no dispute. Whenever, therefore, the pedobaptist attempts to establish his plea of church identity by an appeal to the olive-tree, he palpably violates and sets aside this golden rule of criticism, as stated and indorsed by this Confession of Faith. In his zeal to defend this tradition of his fathers, he entirely disregards those plain declarations of Scripture, which teach, as we shall presently show, just the opposite of that which he is attempting to prove by the olive-tree.

I.—We will, then, in the first place, test the strength and sound-

ness of this plea of church identity, which is claimed to be proved by the olive-tree.

1. The first stand we shall take against this doctrine of infant baptism, argued and defended on the grounds of church identity, shall be the fact that baptism in the room of circumcision is an indispensable and essential element in every argument for infant church-membership. Why this herculean effort to prove that the Jewish theocracy and the Christian church are identical? Because the advocates of infant baptism, knowing full well that there is no express command for such a practice, are driven in their defense to the indirect method of inference and deduction; thus proclaiming, by the very weapons they use, both the poverty of their resources and the weakness of their cause.

This happy idea of church identity, first conceived by Calvin, and servilely followed by his liege sons, would never have been dreamed of, and would now possess no practical value, were it not that it is made to serve as a kind of *limbus infantum* to the church. Hence, the only motive for making the olive-tree favor church identity is, that it may thereby be pressed into the service of infant baptism. But it behooves the advocates of this doctrine to remember that mere church identity alone can not sustain it; for two institutions, such as the Jewish and the Christian churches, might in every respect be identical, save in the mode of ingress, and this one point of dissimilarity would be forever fatal to infant church-membership. Identity might be clearly established, still infant membership could not be thence inferred, unless there is somewhere a door for infants.

We regard this as a matter of the utmost importance in this controversy. It is one which it behooves us to make stand out boldly and to press continually upon our opponents; more especially because they, of late, evince quite a disposition to slur it over and to throw it into the background, as though it were a matter of no importance in this controversy; while, at the same time, they are slyly weaving it in as the very woof of every argument educed in support of infant church-membership. Forty years ago Maccalla made circumcision stand out in the form of a distinct proposition, boldly affirming thus: "Jewish circumcision before Christ, and Christian baptism after Christ, are one and the same seal." But a discussion of twenty years causes the light to go forth, so that the more cunning Rice slyly retreats from the position so boldly assumed by his brother, Maccalla, merely alluding to it as one which he could easily prove were he so disposed, but being a matter of no importance in the controversy it is dismissed with a mere passing notice. And now, after a lapse of less than twenty years, the Rev. J. B. Logan, when confronted by Eld. J. S. Sweeney, flatly refuses to affirm anything on the subject, saying: "My worthy friend has charged me somewhere with making

baptism come in the room of circumcision ; but I have never made such an affirmation as that." (Debate, p. 161.) Then, this position with regard to baptism and circumcision being one and the same seal may now be regarded as abandoned ; and if so, then church identity alone can not sustain the cause of infant baptism. Unless it be proved that circumcision and baptism are one and the same seal, both answering the same purpose, the whole argument fails ; for if there be no door for infants, then there can be no infant membership. We might, then, admit, for the sake of argument, that the olive-tree represents in some general sense the church, still infant membership could not be thence inferred, because the ligament of union between the trunk and the branches may, from anything in the premises to the contrary, be changed so as to exclude infants ; and this we regard as rendered certain by the declaration of the apostle, that the branches "stand by faith."

2. Our second counter-argument shall be one based upon the universally admitted force of language. The fundamental principles of language, being evolved from the laws of mind, are as universal and clearly recognized as those laws themselves ; so that an argument based upon the simple force of language carries with it all the conviction of one derived directly from the constitution of the mind itself. By a fundamental law of mind, every event is referred either to the past, the present, or the future ; so that should we refuse to think of an object or event as connected with one or the other of these relations of time, it could not by any possibility be an object of thought at all.

Furthermore, the laws of our mental being render it impossible for us to think of an event as belonging to more than one of these relations at the same time. If we think of it as happening in the past, then we can not conceive of it as happening either in the present or the future ; if we think of it as happening in the future, then by no possibility can we conceive of it as happening either in the present or the past. In all languages there are clearly recognized forms of speech for expressing these three relations of time, so that whenever the relation of any event to time has been established by language, it is as impossible to sever that relation as it is to destroy a fundamental law of the human mind.

We, then, go back and take our stand with the Savior when he "came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi," and ask to what relation of time did the church of Christ then belong, not as matter of promise, type, or prophecy, but as an actual organized existence ? Did it at that time belong to the past, the present, or the future ? Had it already been established, or was it at that time being established ? Or was it yet to be established ? If it be true, as contended by pedobaptists, that the Jewish theocracy and the church of Christ are identical, then the

church, at that time, had been in actual existence for at least fifteen hundred years ; so that the tense of the church, so to speak, belonged to the past. Is this true ? Let the Son of God respond, and let every mortal reverently hear the grand enunciation he is now about to make, in order that he may forever put to silence the vain babblings of men : "Upon this rock I will build my church ; and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." (Matt. xvi., 18.) The force of our argument based upon this passage, presenting the church under the similitude of a building, depends not upon determining what this foundation is, nor even when it was first laid, but upon the relation which the church, in the mind of its divine Founder when he made this declaration, sustained to time. This question is settled forever, beyond all reach of cavil, by the tense of the verb "will build." Just so certain as that "will build" points to the future, and not to the present or the past, so certain is it that the church, in the mind of Christ when he used this language, was yet in the future as an actual organized existence. In Paul's epistle to the Ephesians, the church, being also considered under the similitude of a building, is spoken of as having changed its relation to time. The apostle, speaking of the Christians at Ephesus, as a part of the household of God, says : "You are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets of the New Testament, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." (Eph. ii., 20.) We perceive that the building of the church, which was in the mind of Christ a future event, becomes in the mind of his apostle an accomplished event ; the "I will build," becoming "you are built." The reason of this is readily understood, when we reflect that the ever-memorable Pentecost had intervened between the two periods at which the Savior and the apostle respectively spoke. It, then, behooves pedobaptists to remember that, while they are so intent on trying to prove church identity by the olive-tree, here is an argument against them which they have never yet answered, and which we predict they never will.

3. One other rebutting argument, briefly stated, shall close this part of our subject. According to the pedobaptist view of the church, it was nearly two thousand years old at the beginning of the gospel age, having been established upon the spiritual promise concerning Christ made to Abraham in his seventy-fifth year, when on the eve of departing out of Haran. But the Apostle Paul assigns no such antiquity to the church in the descriptive phrases which he has seen fit to use. "He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us ; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace ; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross." (Eph. ii., 14-16.) With regard to this interesting passage of Scrip-

ture we raise but one question : What is the meaning of the phrase "one new man?" The apostle himself has explained this phrase by using it synonymously with the term "one body" in the sixteenth verse. But what is the meaning of the term "body" as used in this connection? The answer is found in the twenty-third verse of the preceding chapter. God, says the apostle, "hath put all things under his feet, and given him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." Then the term "man" being equivalent to "body," and this latter to the church, we have the three terms, man, body, and church, as equivalent expressions, all signifying the same thing. But this term "man" is rendered still more definite by the epithet "new." The apostle describes it as the "one new man," new body, new church. But a new church implies an old church. Then, we have here, not one and the same identical church existing in the days of Abraham, and extending into the gospel age, but two churches ; one an old church, and the other a new church. The old church, being the one before Christ, and having grown old, had been superseded by the new church, composed of both Jews and Gentiles, who had been made participants in the blessings of a spiritual covenant "founded on better promises." Furthermore, this new man, new body, or new church, could not be formed till after the middle wall, which served as a means of separation between Jew and Gentile, had been broken down. This, as explained by the apostle, being "the law of commandments contained in ordinances," was broken down ; or, as a law, was abolished by the flesh of Christ, by his death on the cross, when, with his own blood, he "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances," "that he might make in himself of twain one new man," or church. Hence the fact that this new church could not be formed till after the death of Christ on the cross, forever of itself annihilates the sophism of church identity. Now, can any one for a moment believe that the apostle, who wrote under the guidance of "the Spirit of truth," would, in his epistle to the Ephesians, use language which clearly points out two churches,—an old church, and a new church,—and speak of this latter in such a way as to imply that it could not be formed or established till after the death of Christ on the cross, and yet intend by his figure of the olive-tree, in his epistle to the Romans, to teach the doctrine that God has never had but one church in the world, and that this has been the same identical institution in all ages and under all dispensations?

This countervailing proof we regard as unanswerable ; and if so, then it follows that this thing of church identity is a figment of the brain, which finds no countenance or support from the word of God. Hence, we are fully justified in drawing the following conclusion, namely, that, whatever is represented by the olive-tree, one thing is certain,—it can not be the church.

II.—The second part of this essay shall be an effort to give the true exegesis of the olive-tree, showing that it contains no data from which any conclusion can be drawn in support of infant church-membership. What, then, does the olive-tree represent?

1. The idea has been advanced that it represents the nucleus of the Christian church formed on the day of Pentecost. That this view is erroneous we can see at once. How could the unbelieving Jews who formed the larger part of the Jewish nation be, as branches, broken off from that which they were never in? Again: where would be the propriety of making the three thousand converts of Pentecost the trunk of this tree, and all other Christians after them, both Jews and Gentiles, the branches? Besides, the language of the apostle in verse 17 clearly forbids such an idea. He says the Gentile Christians were grafted, not into the stock of the converted Jews, but *en autois*, "in among them," and had been made, with the believing Jews, partakers "of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." Hence, the language of the apostle and the conditions of the figure make both the believing Jews and Gentiles branches which had been united to a common stock and were sustained by a common root.

2. Again: the attempt has been made to meet the pedobaptist argument with the position that the olive-tree represents Abraham; that the relation between Abraham and the Jewish people, as his descendants, is appropriately set forth under the similitude of an olive-tree, the one being the trunk, the other the branches. But, to say nothing of the fact that this relation requires that the root, and not the trunk, should represent Abraham, this view lies exposed to a most serious objection; serious, because of the effect it is calculated to produce in popular controversy. The skillful antagonist will reply, that if the olive-tree represents Abraham, then the Jews, as branches, being united to the trunk by natural descent, by a ligament of flesh, though now in a dispersed condition, are still in union with the parent trunk, are still the children of Abraham; and hence could not be said to be broken off because of unbelief, their rejection of the Messiah not in the least affecting their fleshly relation to Abraham.

3. But the view maintained in Vol. II., No. 3, of the *Quarterly*, possesses a still greater show of truth. According to this view, the olive-tree represents the relation which the Jewish people, as a body, sustained "to the covenant in Christ," so that the phrase "broken off" does not mean the actual deprivation of blessings which the cast-off Jews had once enjoyed, but the withholding from them the gospel privileges which were in store for them as their inheritance. This view, as we apprehend, contains just a half-truth. The breaking off of the unbelieving Jews from the olive-tree was a two-fold calamity. 1. They thereby ceased to be God's people, and forfeited the divine favors which they had previously enjoyed. 2. They lost all the rich

spiritual blessings of the gospel. "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for." (Verse 7.) The blessing sought by unbelieving Israel was righteousness, or justification, and admittance into the kingdom of heaven. Because they sought to establish their own legal righteousness, and refused to submit to God's righteousness, which is by the gospel, they fell under the divine displeasure, and not only failed to obtain the gospel blessings which were in store for them, but also forfeited the blessings of which they had been in actual possession. Here, then, was a two-fold calamity. Now, their being "broken off" evidently refers to the loss of blessings once enjoyed, as the leading, primary thought, and if it refers at all to their failure to obtain their gospel inheritance, this must be regarded as a mere incidental and implied thought. This view alone suits the context. The apostle is speaking of the fall of the Jews, of the sad reverse of fortune they had brought upon themselves, on account of their having rejected the Messiah. "Now, if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fullness? (Verse 12.) Here the fall and diminishing of the Jews evidently means their lessened and degraded state—a state of spiritual poverty, devoid of privileges formerly possessed.

But again: the breaking off of the unbelieving Jews is the antithesis of the grafting in of the believing Gentiles. "The olive-tree was the place of meeting and parting;" so that as the believing Gentiles were grafted into it *de facto*, and thereby entered into the actual enjoyment of the divine blessings, so also were the unbelieving Jews broken off from it *de facto*, and not *in prospectu*, and were thereby deprived of blessings formerly possessed. Furthermore, just so low as is their fall, so high, to the same extent, will be their restoration; "for God is able to graft them in again! They were in the olive-tree, and they shall be grafted in again, or restored back to their former relation, if they abide not in unbelief." Hence, this exegesis to which we have briefly adverted has the appearance of being forced, is slightly tinged with a color of special pleading, as though devised to meet a case, and hence does not fall in naturally with the scope and design of the passage, harmonizing broadly and deeply with it and as a *genesis* growing directly out of it.

4. The failure, thus far, to give the true exegesis of the olive-tree, which, in all respects, might prove satisfactory, is owing, as we apprehend, to the fact that it has been sought from other sources, rather than from a profound study of the figure itself. One of the most fruitful causes of error in biblical criticism is either ignorance of, or inattention to, the nature and laws of figurative language. If we would hope to be successful in the interpretation of any figure, such as a metaphor, an allegory, or a parable, the first step is to inquire into its nature, subject it to a rigid analysis, ascertain the true point

of analogy, and attentively view it in the relation and harmony of its parts. By such a process of investigation we make the figure furnish its own interpretation, which, springing easily and naturally out of the subject, corresponds to the true nature of an exegesis, as the word itself imports. By observing this method with regard to the olive-tree, we feel confident that we shall be able to discover the principle by means of which all the darkness and difficulty which have hitherto attended this passage shall be removed, and its true meaning made to shine forth as clear and bright as the light.

We would, then, in the first place, inquire into the nature of this figure. We perceive, at once, that it is made up of an assemblage of metaphors, consisting of the three principal parts of a tree—the root, the trunk, and the branches. A metaphor is founded on a resemblance of relations between the thing signifying and the thing signified; out of this resemblance arises the propriety of attributing the qualities and properties of the former to the latter. In the figure before us, the metaphors are all related to each other and form a complete image, by being drawn out into a regular, connected discourse. Hence, the olive-tree is properly an allegory, which finds its likeness in that expressive figure in Gal. iii., drawn from the typical personages in the early family of Abraham, “which things,” says the apostle, “are an allegory.” The allegory in Galatians is composed of four metaphors—the two wives of Abraham and their two sons. In the allegory of the olive-tree we have three metaphors: 1. The root. 2. The trunk. 3. The branches. Now, an allegory is the farthest possible remove from an enigma. It is always the design of the writer, and, in fact, belongs to the essential nature of an allegory, that it shall contain within itself the means of its own interpretation. “Allegories,” says Addison, “when well chosen, are like so many tracts of light in a discourse, that make everything about them clear and beautiful.” Trench, speaking of the difference between the allegory and the parable, says: “The allegory needs not, as the parable, an interpretation to be brought to it from without, since it contains its interpretation within itself; and as the allegory proceeds, the interpretation proceeds hand in hand with it, or, at least, never falls far behind it.” (Notes on the paragraph, p. 15.)

Having now ascertained the nature of this figure, and that we must seek the true interpretation from its own inherent light, and not from that which is reflected, we proceed, in the next place, to inquire into the design of the apostle in using this figure. This we will be enabled to do by a brief examination of the context. The church at Rome was composed of two elements, the Gentile-Christian and the Jewish-Christian, the former being the predominating element. From what the apostle says in verse 13, it is plain that the figure of the olive-tree was meant for the Gentile members. By a careful reading

of the entire chapter we perceive that he is speaking of God's dealings with his ancient people, the Jews, his subject being their rejection because of unbelief. The entire chapter consists of two parts ; the first, from verse 1-10, showing that the rejection of the Jewish people was not total, but that there was still left "a remnant according to the election of grace;" the second part, from verse 11-36, that this rejection was not final ; that though Christ crucified had become to the cast-off Jews "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense," yet their fall was not to be regarded as a final and irrecoverable one. It is in this latter connection, where the apostle is speaking of the final restoration of the Jews, that he introduces his figure of the olive-tree, of which he makes a two-fold use ; first, to illustrate and enforce the leading thought of this part of the chapter ; second, to warn the Gentile Christians of the danger of spiritual pride, to which they were greatly exposed from the fact that the Jews, so long God's highly favored people, had been cast off, while they, formerly "without hope and without God in the world," had become his own highly favored people, being admitted to the full enjoyment of all the rich blessings of the gospel. Hence the apostle would have them to guard against self-exaltation, and to cherish an humble fear. "For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." (Verse 21.)

In order, then, to enforce the leading thought of this part of the chapter, viz., that the fall of the unbelieving Jews was not final, the apostle says : "If the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy ; and if the root be holy, so are the branches." (Verse 16.) The latter clause of this verse he elaborates, as we have seen, into an allegory, the metaphors consisting of the three principal parts of a tree, the root, the trunk, and the branches. What do the branches represent ? Evidently the Jewish people, who, as the original branches of the good olive-tree, had been broken off because of unbelief. This is so evident as to require no proof. What does the root of the olive-tree represent ? The relation which the Jewish people sustained to Abraham, as his descendants, point to him at once as the true idea veiled beneath this metaphor. The fact that the Jews are the branches demands that Abraham shall be the root, in order that the propriety of the figure may be preserved. As the branches of a tree are sustained by the vital fluids sent up from the root, so did the whole Jewish nation spring from Abraham, according to the promise which God made him, where he said : "I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee." (Gen. xvii., 6.) "Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea-shore innumerable." (Heb. xi., 12.) There is no figure more natural and expressive than that which represents a fam-

ily descended from the same parent under the similitude of a tree, the trunk and branches of which are descended from a common root. This analogy did not fail to strike the mind of our great English dramatist, who has expressed himself in the following appropriate imagery :

"Edward's seven sons, whereof thyself art one,
Were seven fair branches springing from one root :
Some of these branches by the dest'nies out :
But Thomas, my dear lord, my life, my Glos'ter,
One flourishing branch of his most royal root,
Is hacked down, and his summer leaves all faded,
By Envy's hand, and Murder's bloody axe."

(Rich. II., Act 1, Sc. 2.)

But what are we to understand the apostle to mean by affirming that since Abraham, the root, is holy, his descendants, the branches, are also holy ? Furthermore, what bearing has this upon the subject-matter of discourse, viz., the final restoration of the Jewish people to the favor of God ? The term holy is used in the Bible in two senses ; first, to express the idea of moral purity ; second, that of consecration from common and secular uses to that which is sacred, and which is designed to subserve particular purposes in the divine economy. In this latter sense the Medo-Persian armies are called, in Isaiah xiii., 3, God's "sanctified [or holy] ones," because in destroying the Babylonian empire they were fulfilling the divine purposes. It is evident that this is the sense in which the apostle applies the term to Abraham and his descendants ; for holiness, in the sense of moral purity, can not be predicated of the unbelieving and cast-off Jews. But whence the propriety of predicating holiness of Abraham in the sense of consecration ? Abraham, who stands to the Jewish nation in a relation similar to that of the root of a tree to the branches which spring out of it, was in the divine economy permanently set apart as the head of a family, and separated from the rest of mankind to subserve certain important purposes in the great plan of human redemption. Hence he was a holy, a consecrated person. And as is the root, so also in this respect are the branches. They, too, are a holy, a consecrated people, of whom God will never make an end, because they yet have a most important part to perform in the divine purposes. Israel, though now cast off, degraded, and shorn of his ancient honors, has a glorious destiny yet before him. God intends to make them a blessing to the nations by converting them into zealous missionaries of the cross. Hence, the conversion of the whole Jewish nation and their final restoration to their ancient privileges is an event fixed and determined upon in the mind of Jehovah, in order that all the divine ends contemplated in their separation from the rest of mankind may, at last, be fully realized. The reasonableness and probability of this event the apostle argues from the consideration, that if the Gentiles,

who had never enjoyed a true religious culture, had been brought into spiritual union with God by means of the gospel, much more was it possible for the Jews to be brought again into covenant relation with God, since they had been blessed for so many ages with the light of a divine revelation. "For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree, how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree?" (Verse 24.)

Having now ascertained that the things signified by the root and the branches are, respectively, Abraham and his descendants, the Jews, we shall, in the next place, proceed to ascertain the true idea veiled beneath the metaphor of the trunk of the olive-tree. In order to this, we shall now develop the principle upon which our interpretation hinges, from which it must derive all its merit, if merit there be, with which it must stand or fall, and by which it must live or die. This principle will clearly emerge by a close inspection of the entire passage. By a careful reading of the passage we perceive that there are two olive-trees before the mind of the apostle, forming a kind of double allegory, and which stand in full antithesis to each other. The apostle affirms, in verse 24, that the Gentile Christians, as branches, had been "cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and grafted contrary to nature into a good olive-tree." Here, then, are clearly two olive-trees; a wild one, and a tame one. Out of the wild, the uncultivated, and the unfruitful olive-tree the believing Gentiles had been cut; and into the good, the cultivated, and the fruitful olive-tree they had been grafted. In the light of this circumstance the darkness which has hitherto hovered over this subject is dissipated, and the beautiful allegory of the olive-tree becomes radiant and clear as a gem of light. Furthermore, those two olive-trees are set over, one against the other, in full antithesis. Antithesis, from the Greek *anti*, against, and *titheemi*, to place, "is the opposition of words and sentiments, a contrast by which each of the contrasted things is rendered more striking." Hence, in order to have an antithesis there must be, at least, two things placed in contrast or opposition to each other. When they are of the same class, the antithesis consists in a difference of attributes, of qualities and properties, which belong to those things; when they are of a different class, the antithesis is between the things themselves. "The religious man fears, the honorable man scorns, to do an ill action," is an antithesis of two things of the same class, possessing a difference of attributes. "Religion embraces virtue as it is enjoined by the laws of God; honor, as it is graceful and ornamental to human nature," is an antithesis of two things of a different class, the contrast being between the things themselves, and not in attributes.

The Pauline style is eminently antithetical, especially the epistle

to the Romans. Life and death ; dying to sin, living to God ; sin reigning in order to death, grace in order to righteousness ; the offense of the first Adam to condemnation, the righteousness of the second Adam to justification ; are all illustrations of that antithetical style which adds so much to the beauty, the perspicuity, and energy of style which characterizes this epistle. Now, the apostle, by his use of this figure, has put a key into the hand of a skillful interpreter by means of which he may safely and confidently unlock many difficult passages, the full meaning of which might otherwise remain shut up and hidden. Whately, speaking of this figure, says : " If therefore, the language be so constructed as to contrast together those opposites, they throw light on each other by a kind of mutual reflection." (El. Rhet., p. 372.) A good illustration of this " mutual reflection " furnished by the opposite members of an antithesis is found in 1 Cor. xv., 22 : " As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here the death which Adam has brought upon the whole human race is placed in antithesis to the life which all shall receive by Christ. If, then, we were to quote this passage, as does the Calvinist, to prove the doctrine of hereditary total depravity, or that all mankind, infants as well as adults, are spiritually dead in Adam, then the law of antithesis would drive us into Universalism, since, in that case, the antithetical life by Christ at the resurrection would be of the same kind and as extensive as the death by Adam ; i. e., if the death be spiritual, the life must also be spiritual.

We have, thus, endeavored to explain the nature of antithesis, and to show its importance and value as a principle of interpretation, because, as we have said, it furnishes the means by which alone the pedobaptist argument can be refuted, and the true meaning of the olive-tree fully brought out. Let, then, the fact be noted well, that the apostle, in order to make what he designed to represent by the olive-tree stand out in a bold, a clear, and striking light, has placed opposite to it, in full antithesis, a wild olive-tree. As they both belong to the genus tree, the antithesis must consist in a difference between their qualities and properties, their circumstances and conditions. From this the conclusion follows, with all the certainty of a demonstration, that whatever one of those trees represents the other must also represent, and whatever one of them does not represent the other by no fair principle of exegesis can be made to represent ; for the law of antithesis requires us to eliminate everything from the one that does not find an exact counterpart in the other.

We have now arrived at a point in this essay from which we can see, not only the fallacy of the pedobaptist argument, but also the erroneous nature of the views hitherto advanced by our own side of this question. If the pedobaptist assumption that the good olive-tree represents the church be true, then it follows antithetically that the wild olive-tree

must also stand for a church. Then we have two churches, the Gentiles being members of the one, and the Jews of the other ; so that when the apostle says that the believing Gentiles had been cut out of the wild olive-tree and grafted into the good olive-tree, he means that they had left one church and joined another. But will any one contend that there was anything corresponding to the true idea of a church among the Gentiles ? "They were rallied under every opinion, and were grouped, like filings of steel around a magnet, under every possible shade of difference of thought," having no organic and central principle which could draw them together and harmonize them into one united and consolidated body. Since, then, the wild olive-tree can not represent a church, it follows, incontrovertibly that the thing signified by the tame olive-tree can not be anything like a visible organic church. Make this simple point stand out boldly before the people, and the force of the pedobaptist argument is broken forever, and the luckless wight who with such an air of assurance had based his plea of church identity upon the olive-tree finds himself hopelessly crushed beneath the ruins of his own argument. It is true, he may still contend, like Goldsmith's village schoolmaster who, "even though vanquished, could argue still," but it will be to no purpose. If he still persists in contending that the olive-tree represents the church, challenge him to show what the wild olive-tree represents ; to this he dares not respond without refuting himself.

But the principle which must guide us in this investigation consigns the different views hitherto advanced by our own side of the question to a common fate with the pedobaptist argument. We can see at once that the olive-tree can not represent the nucleus of the Christian church formed on the day of Pentecost, nor Abraham, nor yet again the covenant of grace, for the simple reason that there is nothing in the opposite member of the antithesis to correspond with anything of this kind. In order, then, to grasp firmly and clearly the true idea veiled beneath the olive-tree, everything which does not exist in common between the two olive-trees, the wild and the tame, must be eliminated, and the antithesis sought in the difference of qualities, circumstances, and conditions of this common something, in whatever it shall be found to consist.

We have now proceeded far enough in this investigation to see that the good olive-tree can not represent the church, and that hence it contains no data from which any conclusion can be drawn in support of infant church-membership, but not yet far enough to know of a certainty what it does represent. This is yet confessedly unknown. Is there, then, any clue or circumstance by which we can ascertain what the wild olive stands for ? If so, then we will know immediately, by the reflected light of antithesis, what the good olive represents, about which there has been advanced such a variety of opinions. By thus

proceeding upon a true inductive principle, we obtain through the known a knowledge of the unknown. What, then, is the true idea contained in the metaphor of the wild olive-tree? Horne, on the symbolical language of Scripture, says the wild olive-tree represents man in a state of nature. This comes very near the truth; and his failure to grasp the true idea is doubtless owing to the fact that he did not fully understand the nature of the language found in the seventeenth verse: "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive-tree, wert grafted in among them," etc. When the apostle, in this verse, calls the Gentile Christians "a wild olive-tree," it is evident that he does not mean that they were literally the whole of this tree, for not all, but only a part of it had been assimilated to the good olive. It pleased God to "visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name." (Acts xv., 14.) Hence it is only by synecdoche where the whole is put for a part, the trunk for the branches, that he calls the Gentile Christians "a wild olive-tree." In this we are sustained by biblical critics of the highest authority. The phrase, "'a wild olive-tree,' means," says Bengel, "a twig of the wild olive by a very expressive synecdoche of the whole for a part." "The expression," says Benson, "'a wild olive-tree,' means here a branch of a wild olive-tree, for branches only are engrafted." Hence, it is not exactly correct to say with Horne, and some of our own scribes who have attempted to solve the mystery of the olive-tree, that the wild olive represents man, or the Gentiles, in a state of nature, but rather the state of nature to which all the Gentile nations belonged. The error they commit consists in confounding the trunk with the branches. The wild olive-tree, then, must represent that benighted, ignorant, and degraded state common to the heathen nations,—a state of spiritual darkness, which, as vividly portrayed in the first chapter of Romans, the gathering gloom of ages had intensified, until a knowledge of the true God had faded from the minds of men. That the wild olive-tree represents this heathen state we are compelled to believe, for the simple reason that it can represent nothing else. Then it follows, with the certainty of a demonstration, that the good olive-tree must also represent the abstract idea of state or condition; the antithesis, or contrast, being in the difference of privileges and advantages of those two states, to which the Jews and the Gentiles respectively belonged. The true antithetical idea is pointed out by the apostle himself, when he says in verse 24, that the Gentile Christians, as branches, had been "cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature," and had been "grafted into a good olive-tree." Hence, one of those olive-trees is a wild, an uncultivated, and an unfruitful one; while the other, standing in full antithesis, is a good, a cultivated, and a fruitful olive. Thus, by means of the allegory of the two olive-trees,—the one growing out wild, in a state of nature, uncultivated and uncared for; the

other, the tame or garden olive, green and flourishing, and which of all trees was most cultivated in the East, on account of the oil obtained from its fruit,—does the apostle present in a most clear, bold, and striking light the great difference between the state of special divine favor occupied by the Jews, and that state of the Gentiles which only brought forth “the unfruitful works of darkness.” The religious or spiritual state of the Jews, when compared with that of the Gentiles, was a very exalted and highly favored one. The Jewish people, as the apostle tells us, were beloved of God for their father Abraham’s sake. When they groaned beneath the bitter bondage of Egypt, God, remembering his covenant with their fathers, heard their cry, delivered them from the hand of the oppressor, took them under his wings, and gave them a code of laws and a symbolical religion. “What advantage, then, hath the Jew” over the Gentile? “Much every way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God.” (Rom. iii., 1–8.) From this scripture we perceive that the apostle makes the chief superiority of the state of the Jews to that of the Gentiles to consist in the fact “that to them were committed the oracles of God,” so that they were blessed with the light of a divine revelation, enjoyed a knowledge of the true God, whose favor is life, and whose loving kindness is better than life; while on the other hand, the Gentiles were left to grope their way in darkness, or to feel after God as best they could, by the dim light of nature. Now, this state of favor into which God admitted the Jewish people did not end with the Jewish theocracy, but was extended on into the gospel age; the Jews who received the Messiah, and obeyed the gospel, still remaining in this state, or maintaining their relation to the olive-tree, while the unbelieving Jews were cast out, or as branches broken off from the good olive. Hence, this state of favor is divided into two periods: the first, extending from Abraham, the root, to Christ; the second, from Christ to the end of the world, when faith shall give way to sight, and the tabernacle of God shall be with men. At the coming of Christ, this state was greatly exalted and enlarged; God’s spiritual Israel took the place of old fleshly Israel; Abraham’s faith, and not his flesh, now became the condition of enjoyment; the shadow gave way to the substance, the type to the antitype.

The great difference between those two states is still most strikingly portrayed by Paul’s two olive-trees. In the benighted and degraded condition of heathen nations, such as India and China, we still see what he meant to express by the metaphor of the wild olive; while in civilized nations, such as England and the United States, we behold in the happy and exalted state of true Christians just precisely what is signified by the good olive-tree. To attempt with the pedobaptist to make the olive-tree represent the church, with its ordinances and terms of membership, is to confound the scaffolding with the building,

the vehicle with the state of divine favor, which is thus perpetuated and enjoyed.

From the premises now before us, we feel fully justified in drawing the following conclusion, viz., that the olive-tree, as well as the parable of the vineyard in Matt. xxi., 33, 44, represents the church, or kingdom of God, simply in idea or state, and not so as to include its ordinances and terms of membership. Hence it follows that in the olive-tree there are no data from which any logical conclusion can be drawn respecting the terms of membership in the church of Christ. It is true, that, since the abrogation of the old covenant and confirmation of the new, the Christian church has been built over and around this state, so that he who is now in the church is also in the state, and *vice versa*; yet, if we would grasp clearly the true idea of the olive-tree, the two things, the church and the state, must be kept separate and distinct in the mind. And whenever, like the pedobaptist, we confound those two things together, and affirm of the church what can properly be predicated only of the state, that moment we violate a fundamental rule of criticism, which says, that, "in the interpretation of symbols, types, allegories, and parables, this principle is supreme; ascertain the point to be illustrated, for comparison is never to be extended beyond that point."

Persons not accustomed to abstract thought are greatly assisted in forming clear conceptions by illustration. We will, then, endeavor to make the abstract idea of the olive-tree stand out more clearly, if possible, by means of an illustration, which, at this time, is the best that occurs to us. We have in our American literature the figurative expression "the tree of liberty." We may, in perfect harmony with the laws of figurative language, elaborate this metaphor into an allegory which in all essential points will be an exact parallel with that of the olive-tree. In harmony with the principles of figurative language, we may say that the early colonists, bringing with them the seeds of liberty from the mother-country, sowed them on our North American continent, where, finding a congenial soil, they germinated, took deep root, sprang up, and produced our majestic tree of liberty. Instead of being destroyed by the shock of the Revolution, it passed through this severe ordeal unscathed, and came forth more flourishing and vigorous than before. Those who adhered to the British Constitution, and opposed the new order of things, were excluded from the blessings of the tree of liberty; being compelled to seek refuge in the mother-country; while foreigners who sympathized with our revolutionary sires in their struggle for independence espoused their cause, and became with them partakers of the fruit of our tree of liberty. Between this figure and that of the olive-tree we have in all essential points a complete parallel: 1. Both sprang from small beginnings,—one from a little band of persecuted exiles; the other, from Abraham, the father of the faithful. 2. Both passed

through a revolution,—one of a political nature ; the other of a religious character. 3. In the political revolution some lost the blessings of the tree of liberty, because of their toryism, or a want of political faith ; likewise in that religious revolution by which the Jewish theocracy was destroyed and the kingdom of Christ established, a large part of the Jewish nation, because of unbelief, was broken off from the olive-tree, and thereby lost all their ancient privileges. 4. During the political revolution, foreigners, on account of their devotion to the principles of civil liberty, became with native Americans joint participants in the blessings of the tree of liberty ; also in the religious revolution the believing Gentiles were grafted in among the faithful Jews and with them partook “ of the root and fatness of the olive-tree.”

In view of these four points of similarity, so striking and so complete, any one who can see what the tree of liberty stands for can also see what the olive-tree represents. The humblest capacity can perceive at once that the tree of liberty does not represent a government, with its machinery of civil ordinances and institutions, but simply abstract state or condition. And who, in his right senses, would ever undertake to prove the identity of the colonial and the federal governments, because the tree of liberty was in existence during the colonial period, survived the Revolution, and still remains in existence? He who should attempt such a freak of logic would only subject himself to the ridicule of an intelligent audience. Of equally as great an absurdity is he guilty who undertakes to prove from the olive-tree the identity of the Jewish and the Christian churches ; and the only reason why his cheek does not blush with shame for his own understanding is to be sought in the blinding effects of a theory. To learn the law of naturalization for aliens, or at what age persons are allowed to exercise the right of franchise, we must go, not to the rhetorical phrase, “ the tree of liberty,” but to the Constitution ; so, also, if we would learn the terms of citizenship in the kingdom of heaven, and who are entitled to its honors and privileges, we must go, not to the olive-tree, but to the great commission, the organic law of the kingdom.

That our readers may have a bird's-eye view of the exegesis which we have now given of the olive-tree, and thus be enabled, at once, to test its correctness, it may be summed up as consisting of the four following links :

1. There are two olive-trees before the mind of the apostle ; a wild one, and a good one.
2. These stand in full antithesis to each other.
3. Hence, according to the law of antithesis, whatever one of those trees represents, the other must also represent ; and whatever one does not represent, the other can not be made to represent.

4. The wild olive can represent only the idea of abstract state or condition ; hence the good olive-tree must also represent the simple idea of state.

III.—From the above exegesis four important corollaries flow :

1. *The final restoration of the Jews, as a body, to their ancient honors and privileges.* Though cast off, they are not forsaken. Though they have for ages been enveloped in the flames, yet, like the burning bush of Horeb, they remain unconsumed. Though the thick veil of darkness is now upon their eyes, yet, "when the fullness of the Gentiles be come in," this veil shall be lifted, and, beholding Him who is the glory of his people Israel, they shall exclaim, "Hosanna to the Son of David ; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord !" Though now broken off from their own olive-tree, because of unbelief, yet those scattered, peeled, and withered branches shall be gathered up from the four quarters of the earth, and from the far-off isles of the sea, and be grafted in again, and bear fruit which shall be for the healing, yea, for the life and joy, of the nations. In view of a result so grand, we can only exclaim with the apostle, when contemplating this same subject : "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out !"

2. *The doctrine, once in grace always in grace, shown to be false.* The Jews, once the highly blessed people of God, have fallen from their exalted state, and the Gentiles, once "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise," have been received into the divine favor, and become the people of God. And now, to guard them against the danger of self-exaltation and to keep them from falling away and being lost, the apostle makes the fate of the miserable and cast-off Jews a solemn warning to his Gentile brethren : "For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee."

3. *The great obligation Gentile Christians are under to bring forth fruit to God.* The Jews were broken off from the good olive-tree because they had become unfruitful ; the Gentiles have been grafted in that they may thereby become fruitful. The design of grafting is to make the tree produce a better quality of fruit. But the Gentiles have been cut out of an inferior stock and grafted into a good, a superior olive-tree. And now it is expected that every branch grafted into this good olive-tree, so full of life, so copiously watered by the dews of God's grace, and which is the channel of all divine and saving influences, will be most fruitful. The branch that fails to bear fruit will be cursed and withered like the barren fig-tree.

4. *The olive tree, instead of favoring infant church-membership, is an argument against this doctrine.* The apostle tells the Gentile Christians that they "stand by faith." Hence, since faith, and not

flesh, is the ligament of union between the trunk and the branches, it follows, that infants, not being capable of faith, can not be grafted into and become branches of the olive-tree. All the branches, being united to the trunk by a living faith, are required to abound in the fruits of the Spirit, which are "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance." Infants, not being capable of sustaining a vital relation to the trunk by faith, can not bring forth those fruits, consequently they can not be branches in the olive-tree.

L.

L.'s ARTICLE.—We open the *Quarterly*, for 1867, as will be perceived by the foregoing, with a fine article on the very difficult subject of Paul's allegory of the olive-trees. The subject is important in every view taken of it by L.; and that he has handled it in a manner highly creditable to himself, few in our ranks will be inclined to deny. In every way the article is an excellent one. It evinces an uncommon amount of thought, and that of a very sharp order; it is fair and logical; and shows a skill in handling a difficult passage seldom met with. We doubt whether there is in print, in any language, a solution of the passage of which it treats so little opposed to objection, and so nearly approaching the truth. We have thought much on the allegory of the olive-trees, and, to our mind, the preceding, taking it all in all, is the best thing on the subject we have seen. The theme is doubtless susceptible of greater compression than characterizes L.'s piece; the points of resemblance and contrast might be set a little more strikingly over against one another; and the whole be adapted better to the common mind. But this is to be looked for rather as an after-work than here. We heartily commend the article to the careful reading of the student of the Bible; and should any of our excellent contributors think that he can successfully file objections, or still further elucidate the difficult point, he is most cordially invited to the task. Truth is what we seek.

We would especially invite attention here to one of L.'s conclusions—the restoration of the Jews. To us this has always seemed a *contingent* matter, and one more likely to disappoint the popular expectation expressed by L. than the reverse. Is not the certain restoration of these people an assumption? Can it be proved? If so, who will undertake the task of furnishing it? We should like to print a fine article on the topic. Many are the doubts and difficulties attending the case; and we should like to see it subjected to a sifting. I hardly know a topic that would give more general satisfaction, especially if it were treated in a matter-of-fact, and not in a dreamy, speculative way.

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL IN THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER.

"BEHOLD, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying : Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life ? He said unto him : What is written in the law ? how readest thou ? And he answering, said : Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him : Thou hast answered right ; this do, and thou shalt live." (Luk. x., 25-28.)

This teaching is, in its Jewish sense, in direct antithesis with Paul's theological system as developed in his letters to the Romans and Galatians. "That no man," says he, "is justified by the law in the sight of God, is evident ; for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith ; but, the man that doeth them shall live by them." (Gal. iii., 11, 12.) Now here are two opposing principles from which life is supposed to flow. "Do this, and thou shalt live," is the meaning and spirit of the law, and the mind of the lawyer is directed by the Savior to this principle as a method of obtaining eternal life. But, "The just shall live by faith" is the language of the prophet of God, and this is quoted by the apostle to prove that the life of the just, instead of flowing from the observance of those things that are commanded in the law, emanates, on the contrary, from the principle of faith in Christ. What shall we say then ? Is the apostle at variance with the Master, by whom he is sent ? It can not be. The discrepancy is only apparent. The question before the mind of the Savior was answered according to its time, import, and spirit. Coming as it did from a lawyer, whose object was simply to test the accuracy and extent of the legal information of Jesus, its real significance is brought out in the following paraphrase : Master, what condition does the law require me to fulfill that I might inherit eternal life ? Viewing the matter in this light, we are unable to see how the Savior could answer the question otherwise than as he did. Still we are not inclined to lay stress upon this fact, as we know that the same question was propounded on another occasion by one who was not a lawyer and who was moved with sincere feelings to inquire for the way of life and salvation, and yet the same answer was returned. Here, then, the difficulty deepens, and a knowledge of the relation which the law and the gospel sustain to each other is made requisite in order to discern the propriety of the Savior's reply to the question before us.

Let us, then, look deeply into the matter, and first of all discover, if

we can, the true reason why a legal salvation is deemed by the apostle to be wholly unattainable by man. It is well understood that the law only saves upon the condition of its perfect fulfillment ; and Paul, starting with this principle and reasoning with the facts of human history before him, deliberately comes to the conclusion that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." By this is established, in general terms, the fact that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." But now, how has this happened ? The true answer to this question can be obtained only by a careful analysis of the apostle's reasoning upon this point. Instead of this, his argument has been wholly distorted and a pernicious theory invented which has spread darkness and confusion over the entire field of theological truth. The theory is that all have sinned in Adam, their representative head, and being thus wholly incapacitated by "original sin" for the attainment of righteousness through a legal justification, they are truly said to be "without God and without hope in the world." This is what we understand to be the doctrine of "total hereditary depravity." Now it so happens that the apostle makes no reference whatever to "Adam's transgression" in the connection before us. It is in the third chapter of Romans that he reaches the conclusion which we have stated above. After depicting in the first chapter the awful sinfulness of the Gentile nations, and showing in the second chapter the equal guilt of the Jews, whose circumcision had become uncircumcision through the violation of the law which was given to them, he proceeds in the third chapter to ask and answer the following questions :

"What, then, are we better than they ? No, in nowise ; for we have before proved, both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Surely all this were a needless task and wholly unnecessary to the apostle's argument, if both Jews and Gentiles had sinned through Adam and thereby cut themselves off from "the righteousness which is of the law." In this case reference would have been made alone to Adam's transgression, and "the fall" would have been presented, as in modern systems of theology, as the primal cause which lays man under the necessity of redemption through Christ. There is, indeed, a certain sense in which all men were made sinners by Adam's offense as explained by the apostle in another connection, while reasoning on a different subject. "As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many (the many, all) were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many (the many) be made righteous." (Rom. v., 18, 19.) Now it is clear that as none are made actually righteous by the obedience of Christ, so none are made actual sinners by the disobedience of Adam. But as all are "put into a capacity of

salvation" through Christ, as Bishop Butler would say, so all became subject to sin through the disobedience of Adam. Moreover, the judgment which came upon all men through the offense of one man was not the incapacity of attaining to righteousness, but condemnation to temporal death as explained by Paul in 1 Cor. xv., 21, 22. So also, according to the antithesis and the passage last referred to, the "free gift" which came upon all men through the righteousness of Christ is the resurrection to life, and not a restoration to righteousness, in which case Universalism would follow, as both the "free gift" and the "judgment" are unconditionally bestowed.

The sin of Adam is discounted, then, in estimating the obstacles that lie in the path to salvation and the attainment of righteousness. Men are to be judged according to the deeds that are done in their own bodies, and not by the deeds of another. "The soul that sinneth, it (and not another in its stead) shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son : "the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." As no one is thus answerable for the deeds of another, and yet all are found guilty in the eye of God's law, we are brought back at once to the true cause of man's inability to put forth a claim to the possession of personal righteousness, namely, that all have voluntarily acted upon the principle of disobedience introduced by one man, and thus "sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." Accordingly, it is on this ground, and this alone, as we have already seen, that the apostle rests the conclusion that justification can not be obtained by "the deeds of the law."

Passing now from the grounds on which this conclusion reposes, we are to consider its bearings upon the great principles and facts of the Christian religion. It necessitates, as we shall see, the whole plan of the remedial economy. Here the consequences of a legal justification are fully brought to view and minutely developed by the apostle in his letter to the Galatians : "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." And what then would follow ? "I do not frustrate the grace of God ; for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Thus he who seeks life and salvation by the deeds of moral law, is attempting to "frustrate the grace of God" and to render abortive the death of his Son. Let us pause and consider these results. A great question concerning the atonement emerges, and an issue is formed, on one side of which stands the great apostle to the Gentiles, while on the other the Unitarian, the Socinian, the Rationalist of every school, together with all Moralists and Universalists, are seen ranging themselves in different orders and ranks. Was the death of Messiah a necessity ? Receive first the answer

from his own divine lips : "Thus it is written and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day ; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." The same divine truth was constantly affirmed by the apostle, who everywhere "reasoned from the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead." Is it not natural to suppose that he who reasoned in this way would pen the following paragraph ? "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live ; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me ; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me." There is no leaning here upon his own inherent goodness, nor confidence reposed in his personal worth or his moral deportment. It was Christ who lived in him as the fountain of righteousness and life everlasting. Thus the Messiah came not as a preacher of morality, to reveal and establish a new system of ethics, but to heal and redeem, by his sacrificial death, the nations without God and without hope in the world." It is here that the grandeur of his mission appears in its fullest extent ; and he who looks upon the Savior of the world as simply a moral reformer, has no adequate conception of the true dignity and excellence of our holy religion.

These reflections reduce the issue before us to its simplest form. Are we saved through Christ, or are we saved without him ! The law promises life to all who yield a perfect obedience to all its injunctions, without reference to any other agency. The gospel promises life to none but believers in Christ. Why, then, did not the Savior respond to the lawyer's inquiry in his own sublime language on another occasion : "I am the way, the truth, and the life ; no man cometh to the Father but by me ?" Why apparently ignore the fountain of life in himself, and point the inquirer to an external law as a source of divine life, which seems independent of the mission intrusted to him ? To questions like these the reply is sometimes made that "the law was obligatory at that time, and presented the only method then in existence of obtaining salvation and life." But "if there had been a law given which could have given life" at any time, "verily righteousness should have been by the law," and this, as we have seen, would "frustrate the grace of God," by removing the necessity for the mission and death of his Son. If man ever could have been saved by the deeds of the law, surely heaven would have been spared the great price his redemption has cost. Moreover, if the obligation implied in the law made the reply of the Savior appropriate in the instance before us, there is no reason why the same question should not receive the same answer now, for the law is obligatory still. "Think not," says the Savior, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to

fulfill. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in nowise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." We are still under obligation to love the Lord our God supremely, and our neighbor as ourself; but this, in fact, is a summary of the whole law. "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets," and therefore the whole moral law still remains in full force. God's moral government never changes, for the principles upon which it is based are eternal. The perpetuity of his law follows from its very nature. That which is morally right never can be morally wrong. It never can be right to hate the great author of our being, or love the great enemy of our souls. The foundation of this higher morality is, therefore, immutable, and the moral law itself is imperishable. Men may call evil good, and good evil; but that does not alter the nature of either, nor obliterate the unchangeable distinction between them. Nay, we might go even further than this. The distinction here is independent of the will of God himself. A thing is not morally good because it is willed by him; but, on the contrary, he wills it because it is good. The very definition of a moral precept involves this thought. A law or precept of this kind is usually said to be given because it is right; and if this definition is held to be unexceptionable, it follows that the moral law is not binding because of its presence in either of the Testaments, but possesses an authority quite independent of that fact.

Here it becomes necessary to consider an objection which Rationalism proposes. It was this feature of the moral law which led F. W. Newman to affirm that "an authoritative external revelation of moral and spiritual truth is essentially impossible to man." Now we are quite willing to admit that it is within the province of reason to sit in judgment upon the morality of the Bible; but deny that the necessity or possibility of an external revelation of moral truth and duty is thereby superseded. In other words, we affirm the necessity of such a revelation, notwithstanding the character of its contents is submitted to the test of human reason. That our moral faculties may be stimulated to activity, the presentation of moral truth is just as requisite as is the presence of light that the faculty of vision may exercise its legitimate functions. There are no moral truths printed, as it were, upon the human soul, nor does the philosophy of moral intuition involve a doctrine so absurd. No intuitionist, since the publication of Locke's *Essay on the Human Understanding*, and, perhaps, none before that time, ever seriously entertained the theory of innate ideas, propositions, or judgments, either moral or intellectual. The greatest expounder of the intuitionist philosophy, Consin, has delivered himself on this point in the following language: "From the point at which we have arrived we can easily appreciate the doctrine of innate ideas, the refutation of which fills the entire first book of the *Essay on the*

Understanding. The moment has come to explain ourselves in regard to this doctrine, and in regard to the refutation which Locke has given of it. Locke divides the general doctrine of innate ideas into two points, general propositions or maxims and ideas. And we all reject innate propositions and ideas, and for the very simple reason that there are in nature neither ideas nor propositions." A full development and lucid exposition of the philosophy of intuition are given by Dr. McCosh, in his work on the *Intuitions of the Mind* which has recently been published. A careful perusal of this great work will convince the intelligent reader that great ignorance and confusion generally prevail in regard to the doctrine of intuition, and that this doctrine, properly understood, affords no comfort to those who seek, by means of it, to undermine the authority and reality of an "external revelation of moral and spiritual truth." While the authority of a moral precept may not be derived from the book in which it is found, a knowledge of the precept itself may be derived exclusively from that source. Thus, while we are dependent upon revelation for our knowledge of the moral law, when this knowledge has been obtained, and the law is presented to the mind, the moral sense at once pronounces its authority underived and independent even of the will of the lawgiver. We say it is enjoined, because it is right, and this is moral intuition.

At this point it is necessary to observe that the positive enactments of the law, as, for instance, the Sabbath and circumcision, not being of the nature described above, are not of necessity, perpetual, but deriving their authority exclusively from the will of the lawgiver, they have ceased to be obligatory, for the want of a re-enactment under the new institution. And here we lay down a fundamental principle touching the general relation which the Old and the New Testaments sustain to each other. This is, that the silence of the New Testament in regard to any positive institution of the Old is, to such institution, the seal of condemnation. Does not the will of God, as revealed in the New Testament, cover the whole ground of man's relations to heaven and earth? Is it not, indeed, the sum total of all the duties growing out of these relations. If these questions are answered in the affirmative, and answered thus they must be, then the principle above postulated of necessity follows. Yet, strange as it may appear, the very silence of the New Testament has often been construed as a virtual affirmation of Old Testament institutions. Show us, says one, where this precept or that ordinance has ever been repealed! Nay, show us, we reply, where it has ever been re-enacted, and then, only then, will its continued obligation be admitted.

The class of commandments just described, includes likewise the ritual and ceremonial portions of the law, and hence many, recognizing the perpetuity of the moral law, have supposed that the apostle

had reference alone to the ceremonial law when he affirmed of Christians that they are "not under the law, but under grace," and that "now we are delivered from the law, that being dead (to that) wherein we were held, we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter." Now it is true that the Jews sought to impose even their ritual upon the believing Gentiles as an indispensable condition of their salvation; yet we think, with Neander, that while Paul, in opposition to these, "had occasion, as in the epistle to Galatians, to impugn the justifying power and continued obligation of the ceremonial law, still his argumentation proceeds on the whole idea of the law," and "there must," as he asserts, "be a special reference to its moral precepts, for in this consisted the difficulty of fulfilling it." This conclusion is sustained by several clear passages of Scripture. "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? * * * For if that which was done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious." (2 Cor. iii., 7, 8, 10.) There is certainly no reference here to rites and ceremonies, since it is the law which was "written and engraven in stones" that is here declared to be done away. To the same purpose also is the passage in Col. ii., 14, which represents the Savior as "blotting out the handwriting of ordinances, which was against us, taking it out of the way and nailing it to his cross." The term "ordinance" may sometimes refer to ceremonial enactments, but the Greek term which it here represents, properly denotes a decree. The meaning of the expression, however, is fixed by the term "handwriting." It is that law which was "written with the finger of God" upon tables of stone which stood, indeed, "against us," but which has now been "blotted out" and "nailed to the cross" of our blessed Redeemer.

There is, then, a sense in which the moral law, though perpetual, is abrogated for believers; as there is a sense in which, though abrogated, it is fulfilled in every Christian's life. The explanation of this mystery is found in a knowledge of the relation which the law and the gospel sustain to each other. We shall see in the sequel that the latter is, indeed, but the complement of the former, and the indispensable condition of its fulfillment. In what sense, then, we ask, has the moral law been "blotted out?" Being immutable and eternal in principle, it must in some way have undergone a change of form, as it could only in this respect be susceptible of mutation. It was indeed, in a fearful sense, "the ministration of death," standing as an outward, compulsory, accusing code, with its inevitable penalty annexed, visiting its fearful anathemas without mercy upon every transgressor, and devoting its hapless victims to the terrors of condemna-

tion and death. Such we say it was ; but "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us," and "bearing our sins in his own body on the tree," that we henceforth "might be made the righteousness of God in him." Thus the abrogation of the law consists, according to Paul, in our redemption from its "curse," the removal of its penalty, and the utter overthrow of its power to condemn. According to this view, the very perpetuity of the law demanded its formal abrogation ; while in this abrogation it has really been fulfilled. Had not its sentence been imperative and absolute, the necessity of redemption could never have existed. It is precisely because it is irrevocable, that provision must be made to satisfy its just demands ; and to furnish this provision and to render this satisfaction, is indeed the sole object of the gospel of Christ.

These reflections suggest, by anticipation, the solution of another difficulty touching the fulfillment of the moral law. We have seen that, "by the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified" in the sight of God, since "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," while "the righteousness which is of the law" can only be obtained by man upon the condition of a perfect obedience to all of its precepts. It is clear, then, that man is unable to fulfill the righteousness of the law in his own person ; and since the possibility of obtaining eternal life is suspended upon its fulfillment, it is important to inquire in what way it is fulfilled in the life of the Christian. This is explained by Paul in the following paragraph : "What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and (by a sacrifice) for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." We see now that the language of the Savior, in his answer to the question of the lawyer, is susceptible of a new interpretation, and that he did not in reality ignore the fountain of life in himself, nor point the inquirer to an independent source of salvation and life. The comprehensive precept, "Do this and thou shalt live," contained but a half of the truth, while the other and more important half remained to the lawyer unrevealed. Had the occasion demanded it, and the law of propriety not intervened, the Savior could have added : You can only "do this" by accepting the benefits of the sacrifice to be made in my person, by which the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in all who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. It is still true, then, that we should fulfill the obligations arising from our relation to the eternal moral law ; and it is also true that if we do this we shall inherit eternal life ; but it is impossible to do either except through the agency of Him who is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."

The doctrine of the imputation of righteousness has excited much

controversy among theological writers, who seem, in fact, to disagree more about words than things. The Scriptures present the subject in a very clear light. Take the following passage : "David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." According to this description the imputation of righteousness is equivalent to the non-imputation of sin, and does not consist in the transference of any moral qualities to the recipient of this blessing. But it is asked : Do the Scriptures teach that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer ? That depends upon what is meant by "the righteousness of Christ." This expression has both a subjective and an objective signification. Subjective, as denoting the moral attributes and personal excellence of Christ ; and objective, as denoting the state of favor and acceptance with God attainable through Christ. If the expression is taken in the former acceptation, the question before us must be answered in the negative, according to the import of the passage quoted above ; but if by "the righteousness of Christ" we are to understand the righteousness attainable through him, it seems but little more than a simple truism to say that this is imputed to us. Now this, we believe, is all that is meant by those who contend that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer ; and certainly no one would reject the doctrine in this sense, unless he would deny, in opposition to the apostle, that "Christ is the end [the perfection or fulfillment] of the law for righteousness to every believer." It is, moreover, declared that he was made a sin-offering for us, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him ;" and that he is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

The general conclusion deducible from the whole premises now before us may be stated as follows : The Lord Jesus Christ is the fountain of righteousness and life everlasting ; while our own morality and obedience to law, so far from being an independent source of salvation and life, can only receive the recognition of their fulfillment through him. This great truth, however, is sometimes stated in language so ambiguous as to convey a false meaning. Take the following declaration of Neander : "Justification and salvation by faith in the grace of redemption, are independent of every law to the believer." Now the "grace" or favor of God is itself regulated by law, and whatever results from his favor must, therefore, conform to this law. If Neander intended to assert that law is not a source of salvation, we have no debate with him on this point ; but if he means that law is not a condition upon which the enjoyment of this blessing is secured, we demur, and affirm that his assertion is contradicted by innumerable declarations of Scripture. "Blessed are they that do his

commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city." Here is a borrowed "right" conditionally bestowed—a righteousness depending on obedience to law as a condition indispensable to its enjoyment. We do not say that Neander, whose language is ambiguous, has contradicted this plain teaching of the holy Scriptures ; but what are we to think of Alexander Carson, whose great intellect was so thoroughly warped by the pernicious influence of Calvinistic theology as to dictate the following antisciptural dogma : "If God requires any conditions on the part of sinners, it is impossible that salvation is of grace. * * * On the other hand, if it can be said that salvation is of grace, that eternal life is the gift of God, then it is absurd and contradictory to suppose that the performance of anything is required on the part of man." If this reasoning be correct, Dr. Carson should never have returned thanks for his daily food to the Giver of every good and perfect gift. No Calvinist can, in fact, consistently discharge this duty. The inexorable condition annexed in the beginning to the privilege of partaking of food has been rigorously exacted of all the descendants of Adam : "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground." Labor is thus the law of man's temporal blessings, and these are never bestowed except on that condition. But, according to Dr. Carson, "if God requires any conditions," if "the performance of anything is required on the part of man," it is "absurd" to speak of the blessing bestowed, as a gift, or a matter of grace ! Let the Calvinist, then, for the sake of consistency, claim the fruits of his physical toil as his own, and deny that God has anything to do with these conditional blessings. The simple truth is—and it is marvelous that Carson could not see it—that a gift is a gift, whether bestowed on conditions or not ; and God is its author as much in the one case as in the other, and therefore, in all cases, we are under the same obligation to exercise gratitude to him for all blessings received.

"Do we, then, make law void through faith ? It can not be. Yea, we establish law." The compatibility and coexistence of law and the new system of grace are thus recognized. Paul's antithesis of grace and works belongs to a different category. His "works" are deeds of merit, and not simply the conditions of favor. "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Here, then, the idea of "debt" or merit attaches to the class of works mentioned by him. Such works, of course, can never be reconciled with a system of favor ; but he who infers thence that the favor of God is capriciously bestowed, and not exercised on conditions, should learn to distinguish between things that differ, and not, in his vain reasonings, deny the plain teachings of the Bible. G.

BRUCE VANCE'S EXPERIENCE.

BRUCE VANCE was born in the State of —, a State which, let me inform the reader, is entitled to the credit of being the birthplace of more men than Bruce. In what county the Vances lived can not at this date be confidently said; it is only believed that there Bruce first saw the light. Of the pedigree of the Vances little is known; and although quite unable to trace their lineage back to its origin, they were always of the opinion that, could they have done so, they could clearly have shown themselves to be connected with some of the best of families. They were never enabled to say that the blood of great dukes ran in their veins; but they boasted that, as far back as authentic records reached, not one of their women had ever been drowned for being a witch, nor one of their men hanged for petty larceny. They often dwelt on this fact with peculiar pleasure. I am, myself, of the opinion that they were clearly the inheritors of gentle blood. The family was noticeably modest. They never offensively perked their breeding in your face. They only bore themselves a little haughtily at times, and dropped hints in under-tones. Their faint airs of superiority came out only amid clusters of true rustic grace, and never gave offense to your own plebeian extraction. You felt yourself always at home with the Vances.

The family claimed a Scotch origin; and McDougald was the foreign name most frequently heard in their lips. True, they never avowed themselves McDougalds; but when genealogy was the topic in hand, they knowingly looked each other in the face and pronounced that name with melancholy sweetness. Scott and "Bobby" were their favorite poets, and Bruce was the pet name of the family. When they pronounced the word highlands, the *i* was sounded like long *e*; and the legends of that romantic spot were familiar to them as household words. Their faith was a hereditary faith, their manners hereditary manners, their speech hereditary speech. Over these their pride rose high, and they obstinately refused to admit innovations. Still time wrought changes even in the family of the Vances. They gradually grew less like themselves and more like their neighbors. Few families are proof against such transformations. Nor is the fact a matter for deep regret. In one thing only the Vances never changed. Their hereditary superstitions never suffered a single mutation. Here marvel and veracity were perfectly consistent; and whatever else you did, you must never question the reality of one of their tales. This was an offense never to be forgiven.

Archibald Vance, the patriarch of the family, was the owner of a

somewhat pretentious little estate. Never did family prize estate more than the Vances prized this ; nor did family ever have better reasons for its appreciation. Seed suits not pod better than it suited them. It was a picturesque tract. Its peaks rose to no vulgar height ; its ravines were deep and silent ; its pines were tall, its copse thick, its owls of the largest size. On one corner of the estate lay the ruins of the identical church which, when new, had mysteriously fallen down on a clear bright Sabbath day, the very day on which his pious parents had had Archibald christened. The event was ever afterward regarded by the family as ominous. No Vance's foot was ever allowed to press these ruins ; and they were never named except in whisper and with profound awe. Hard by these ruins was an ancient graveyard ; but not within the memory of living man had a fresh human bone been laid in it. It was wholly disused. The traditionary reason for this none will pronounce insufficient. Miss Polly Kealing, in time long gone, had in disgrace given birth to an infant in a neighboring wood, which she had there murdered and hid. The infant was found and for the deed the mother was hanged. Both mother and infant were buried in this graveyard. Instantly all the surrounding trees died ; the shrubbery dropped its leaves ; the waters of a clear bright spring which ran out of the hill at its base suddenly turned livid and bitter ; and a strange bird, which uttered a horrid note, ever afterward flapped its wing the livelong night over the buried babe. From that day no man durst lay his dead in that ground. Besides, a curious plant grew out of the mother's grave, which bore leaves the size and shape of an infant's hand. These leaves were always dropping blood. It would clot and lie for days on the ground ; and people traveled far to see it.

Not more than a quarter of a mile from the Vance mansion was a large cave running back into the mountain, no one knew how far. From this a heavy current of wind was always issuing, making, as it rushed out, a hoarse wailing sound, singularly painful to the ear. Here many a skeleton had been dug up with skull mashed in and bones pierced with bullets. How they had come here no living mortal knew ; but that the place had been the scene of many a foul deed, no reasonable man could doubt. Far back in this cave, on drizzly nights, could be heard the most unearthly screams that ever pierced the air ; and on more occasions than one the Vance family had seen mutilated ghosts darting to and from, as if intent on some terrible act of vengeance. None but the most undoubted courage was equal to the task of visiting the place on such nights. Even in broad daylight, if you went far into the cave, and stood in a particular niche, you could hear as it were the chattering of teeth, and men groaning and strangling in their blood. The noise was absolutely appalling, and made the very flesh creep on your bones. The stoutest mastiff

would crouch at your feet and quake and whine as if in intense pain, and no other animal could be enticed near the dreadful spot.

On a hill-top northeast of the house stood an immense mound, evidently of very great antiquity. Here arrow-heads of flint were found, and human teeth of enormous size. No doubt it had been, in olden time, the scene of a most sanguinary battle, and here now lay the rotted bones of the dead then slaughtered. No acre on his estate was so highly prized by Archibald Vance as this mound. Long since it had become covered over with tall pines, through which the winds were ever sighing. Great vines, whose roots were fertilized by the blood of buried warriors, had clambered over these pines, and now festooned their tops with a dense foliage, making the place hideous with perpetual night. Huge burrows ran far into the mound, where ferocious she-bears had in time long past nursed their whelps in the very dust which had once been the flesh of living men. A battle-axe, of a size which none but a giant might essay to handle, was occasionally found, with many other curious implements, the use of which has never yet been divined. The relics of this kind were countless, but the Vance family would never suffer them to be carried off, or in any other way molested. They were kept as mementos of a time and of a race the very memory of which had long since perished. But the circumstance which, above all others, endeared this mound to its owners was an event which occurred annually about the first of October, or just before the forest leaves begin to fall. About this time, and continuing for several weeks, as soon as night set in, tremulous sensations could be felt in the ground; the wind would moan loudly through the trees; a noise, like the tramp of thousands of horses' feet, could be heard, with frightful crashings, as if of trees falling and breaking. Through all this would come a sound like the heavy, exhausted breathing of laboring men, and with this would be mingled smothered groans, as if uttered in the agonies of death. Torches would glare through the darkness, and light up the awful place with a blue fitful glimmer unlike anything human eye has ever seen. Rooks could now be seen perched on the pines, silent and motionless, as if dead. And now tall chieftains, in ponderous armor, would begin to stride over the mound, dragging after them mangled corpses, which they chopped and hacked in the most shocking manner. The scene now became terrible and grand beyond description. Whole nights the Vances would spend on the mound at this season; and many were the strangers whose curious ears they delighted with the tale of the sights then seen. Bruce not only heard these stories from parental lips, but himself had seen the sights, and could detail them to you with a minuteness and emphasis which showed how they impressed his young spirit. From his cradle he knew them well. They were his first lessons, and never did boy

learn lessons better. Bruce Vance never played marbles and fished. These were vulgar pastimes. His idle days were spent in the cave; his sleepless nights on the mound.

From these his soul caught inspiration, poetry, religion. They shaped his thoughts, gave him his dialect, and filled his nights with dreams. His plane of life consequently lay high above that of the great common herd of boys. Romance and idealism had no charms for him. Stern realities of that mysterious world, whose confine only touches this, were the food which gave strength and fertility to his brain.

Besides, Bruce Vance, on more accounts than one, was singularly fitted to be profited by the scenes of his paternal estate. He was the seventh son, with no intervening sister, and was born with a vail over his face. From the very first, high expectations were entertained of the boy. Wrinkled dames vowed his body must first be washed only in mare's milk and the juice of a curious plant which grew on the mound, called pilpel, with which, if an infant were bathed before the ninth day, it endowed him with the seventh sight. This sight is the rarest gift known to men. It can be conferred only on children born as was Bruce. It gives the power of detecting and curing all diseases of more than nine years' standing. With this power it was decided to endow Bruce as soon as the vail on his face was seen. The ceremony was completed in due form; and from that instant Bruce Vance was no common child. Soon patients began to visit him from near and far. They were laid flat on the back, and little Bruce was led over them from crown to toe seven times. The cure was instantaneous. The pride of the Vance family now rose high, and the name of McDougald was more frequently heard than ever. Great chairs of State continually haunted the other boys, and brilliant foreign missions were the common table chat. The family soon grew very unpopular. Low rustic jealousies did the work. Trouble now set in—that common inheritance of all, and the peace of a harmless family was forever broken.

The Vances were accused of superstition, and charged with belief in witchcraft. They repelled the charge with haughty indignation. No Vance had ever been so low. True, they saw the sights on the mound, the cave was on their own land, and that strange plant was daily dropping blood. But belief in these was one thing, superstition a different. Witchcraft they held in detestation. It was a vulgar trick. Persons of mean blood might stoop to it, but never a Vance. Ten women had seen the vail on Bruce's face; his cures were real cures. Notoriously the whole McDougald clan had ever been seers of sights and hearers of sounds. Were the Vances to be rated below these? Preposterous! But old Nancy Stokes's cow had been seen browsing near the ruins of the fallen church, and for ten months

afterward gave bloody milk. What of that? The black snakes had caused it. Why, then, lay it on the Vances? The tale carried on its very front the proof that it was the invention of an old hag. But rumor was at work, and the Vances were in grief. Particularly Archibald's head hung low. The fair name of his family had been impeached. Could he survive the shame?

Mrs. Vance took things more philosophically. She reminded her husband that these idle tales are generally short-lived; that Bruce was coming forward; that the prospects of the family were never before so fair; and that now to be broken by the lie of an old wench, who was moved to her deed by the standing of her betters, was below her blood. She would never yield to it. Archibald became assured, and the family more cheerful.

One noble trait adorned the family of the Vances. Religion with them was a life deep, broad, and never ending. Their faith and trust in God were sublime. In piety they were never a common family. Their love of Christ was exhausting, and measured only by an ability which seldom falls to the children of earth. True, their religion was muddled by a large admixture of what the world calls superstition; but with them it was all faith. They lived on the border of that vast Unseen which teems with life and spiritual intelligence. From this Unseen they were separated by a line not always distinguishable, and which, as it was no crime to cross it that way, so it was none to cross it this. What, then, if occasionally a ransomed spirit, in its merry gambols, transgressed the line this way! Was this a crime? No Vance believed it. And as to these spirits being seen, this was a simple question of fact, to be accepted on the veracity of him who affirmed it. A Vance superstitious! The thing was impossible. No, the difference between the faith of a Vance and that of other men lay here: the faith of a Vance was the immediate sight of the soul into the most sublimated of nature's mysteries; it was the spirit's clear intuition of what is, not through means of vulgar symbols addressed either to the eye or the ear, but through a power inherent in the spirit itself, a power inexplicable, intransmissible, and belonging only to those exquisite natures, a few of which are still left to earth as witnesses of God. The faith of other men is the mere gross assent of the mind to things, based on report or testimony. This faith, with a Vance, was fit only for the base plebeian rout; the other alone was worthy of the blood of McDougalds. The religion of a Vance, therefore, was not to be tried by the tests which serve to determine the religion of other men. It defied these tests, and claimed to be amenable to no law save its own; and of this law the great outside world was wholly ignorant, and hence must not presume to apply it. Consequently, in their religion the family were insulated from their neighbors more perhaps than in anything else. And this circumstance

brought with it no little sorrow. They were pronounced eccentric, whereas they were simply what they believed God required them to be, and hence could not change.

About this time Archibald Vance, the head of the family, fell sick and died, very suddenly and very unexpectedly to every one. The family were overwhelmed with grief ; for never was family more dependent on father than were his, and never was father more tenderly loved. He left them, however, a noble inheritance—a spotless name, and a triumphant death. Particularly had they reason to be proud of the latter. No death could be more sublime. A few hours before it happened he grew blind. He felt that his end was at hand, and called his family near him. “Mother,” he fondly said to his faithful wife, whose heart was bursting within her, “I tread the dark valley of the shadow of death now, but I tread it in no timid mood. My courage is high, for my Master is beside me. He has locked his arm in mine, and says : ‘On, faithful, on. I will hold the lamp for you in life’s great crisis, and light up this gloomy way. Fear not. As death breaks the pitcher at the fount, I will catch the fragments in these hands. Again, fear not ; I am here.’” Archibald’s countenance brightened as he closed this sentence, and a divine smile played over that wan face. He now took leave of his wife, and then, one by one, of all his children. The parting on his side was calm and thoughtful. With each he left a word of weighty advice, and his blessing. This done, he straightened himself in the bed, folded his hands on his breast, and said : “Now, Lord, life is done. I have fought the fight ; whether I have kept the faith, or not, you know ; my course is finished ; receive me to yourself.” In a moment he was dead. He was buried on his own little estate, where his modest grave may be seen to this day.

On looking into his business, it was soon found that his estate was hopelessly involved. This, to the family, was matter both of astonishment and grief. Archibald Vance had always been most careful and scrupulous in regard to going in debt. His maxim through life had been—owe no man anything. But bill after bill was presented, and account after account poured in, till they footed up thousands of dollars. And what amazed the family most of all was that these accounts were rendered for articles which not one of them had ever heard of before. But each account was minutely proved in open court, and hence of course was allowed. Suspicions of foul play grew large with the family, but they were powerless. They now began to feel what many widows and orphans had felt before them—that few men are to be trusted where a sense of justice is all that restrains them from gains which may be acquired without it.

The Vance family had borne themselves a little haughtily at times. This had stung unscrupulous neighbors. The time had now come

when these neighbors could be avenged, and on it they were bent to their heart's content. By every means which low cunning can invent, and such means are neither few nor uncommon, the family were harassed. They were twitted with their former airs of superiority, and coarsely reminded that a day of reckoning had at last come. For this day their innocent hearts were ready, had there not come with it a day of shameless injustice. But nothing that could wound them was unsaid ; nothing that could rob them, undone. To the family even life itself had become intolerable, and they sighed to sleep the sleep of their father. At length the day of sale came on. Hardly had the day on which Archibald Vance had been buried been more bitter to them, as they saw article after article of the household goods change hands beneath the hammer of the auctioneer. The flute on which a lamented father had on countless nights played most sweetly became the property of a coarse country boy, famous only for the fact that he chewed tobacco more vulgarly and swore more profanely than anything else in the land. The fine gun passed into the hands of Joe Stokes, the brother of Nancy, who had always been ready to make oath that the Vances, to his certain knowledge, had bewitched his sister's cow. Sam Kealing, a detestable rake, bought Bruce's pony and saddle. Thus these little mementos, always so highly prized by a family possessed of any refinement, passed one by one away. At length the homestead itself was offered. Some questions were asked in regard to the widow's dower. Mrs. Vance authorized the auctioneer to say that she would on the spot relinquish all her right in the estate to the purchaser. On this a niggard, by the name of Arnold, bid five dollars per acre for the land. (It was worth at least thirty.) The auctioneer dwelt long on the five dollars. No man advanced on it a cent. The signs of collusion now became too clear. It was obvious that Arnold's money had silenced the crowd. At last the auctioneer said "gone," and Arnold was pronounced the buyer. He at once, with that heartless smile so familiar to the swindled widow and orphan, let Mrs. Vance know that he was now the lawful owner of her late husband's estate ; that a lawyer was on the ground to take the relinquishment of her dower ; and that he should expect the premises to be vacated the next day. He was meekly told that his wishes would be complied with.

The next day that splendid homestead and the grave of Archibald Vance were forever abandoned by his family. No sadder sight can be imagined than that of that stricken family, with their earthly all now crowded into a single borrowed cart, moving away to an humble log cabin, kindly tendered them by a gentleman from a distant neighborhood. In this cheerless abode that gentle woman and nine tenderly raised children were huddled together. How they there lived a merciful Father alone knows. Death would have been a relief to all, from mother down.

But now for the first time in life the heroism of that noble woman fairly awoke. Despair was fast settling down on the spirits of the older children. This she saw would soon prove fatal. It was evident that everything now depended on her. She resolved to become equal to the task. At once she put on a more cheerful look, and began to speak with a bold, decisive voice of what must be done. Soon her children caught her spirit, and began to exhibit signs of a strong will and fine energy—those sure guarantees of success in all the ranks and walks of life. Other excellent traits soon began to come to light. It was not long before the whole family began to show marks of decided superiority. As if by magic, they grew at once out of the indolent, half-dreamy life which had been fostered amid the strange scenes of their recent home. The tales of the cave and of the mound gradually died on their lips. The name of Polly Kealing was never named from the day Sam purchased Bruce's pony. Those silent rocks and that curious plant were things of memory, not of chat. Stern questions of real life were now discussed with a shrewdness and hardihood which would not have done discredit to any political economist of the land.

But over all the fine traits of the family their religious nature held the pre-eminence. This was indeed their glory and their crown, nor can anything be imagined more lovely. The children had all been christened in infancy, though not one made any pretensions to a renewed heart. Their deportment was eminently proper, but it was not claimed to be Christian. The mother was the head of the family here. God and each morning and each night alike witnessed prayer in her family. On these occasions the Scriptures were regularly read, the children reading with her. The reading done, she would add: "Children, let us all worship God." They all bowed before the divine Father, and invoked his blessing. And if on any scene of earth God looks down with peculiar pleasure, surely it must be on a scene like this. When a pious mother gathers her little flock about her, and with heart and hands upraised to heaven commits them to the keeping of Him who watches the fall of the little sparrow, the world may call it superstition, but I as much believe that God keeps that family as I believe he guides the orb of day. Ask me not how, cold skeptic. My faith is in the fact; I am ignorant of the mode.

The energy and industry of the older boys soon secured them places of business. At once they took rank among the first young men of the country. They accumulated property rapidly. Scarcely had three summers passed over her head till Mrs. Vance found herself snugly housed in a neat little house, the gift of dutiful and frugal sons. The days of bitterness and want seemed past. Once more, in a high degree, they were a happy family, but never completely so. They mourned still the loss of their father with an anguish of spirit which nothing could cure.

The religious influences with which they were surrounded were chiefly Baptist, and that of a very rude type. The preachers were rough, uneducated men, but generally reputed very honest and sincere. Their preaching was a complete medley of superstition, Scripture, and nonsense. With them every passage bore a mystic double meaning, and that meaning which lay remotest from every dictate of common-sense was sure to be seized upon as the true one. It is hence no matter of wonder that to those who sat under their ministrations the path of life should have lain through impenetrable mists. To these men the most insoluble question of life is life's most important question, "How can I become a Christian?" To this, it is true, each preacher had an answer, but that answer consisted in repeating a curious jumble called his experience. Of these experiences, unfortunately, that one was generally selected as the model which abounded most in the elements of the marvelous and grotesque. No discourse was deemed complete without an experience; no experience complete without the appearance in it of the Devil, an angel, or a ghost. The larger the admixture of these, the less was the orthodoxy of an experience to be suspected. As for the Bible, it was simply a thing of no account except to furnish the preacher a text. No more could it aid a man in struggling into life than could the obsolete almanac of the preceding year. Where its decisions clashed with the traditions of the day, or the standard experiences of the church, it was tossed aside with as little compunction as though it had been some vulgar nuisance. Hence, of true scriptural knowledge the people may be truly said to have had none. The grossest darkness filled their minds. Honest and pious, for the most part, they certainly were, but their ignorance of the way of life was profound.

It was in a community like this that Bruce Vance's mind began to mature. He was a fine model of a sprightly, innocent country boy; was as inartificial as a child, and intensely religious by nature. The hereditary faith of his father he had well-nigh forgotten amid the hardships which followed his death. Indeed those gloomy days had had a most unhappy effect on Bruce's mind. They had, to a fearful extent, forced into it the conviction that that thing which the world calls Christianity is a sham, and that its votaries are all hypocrites. In this judgment Bruce was certainly in error; yet it is much to be regretted that there is so much in the world, seemingly at least, to justify it. Its defect lay in this, that it was a judgment based on too partial an induction; and in that induction the bad examples alone, and not the good ones, had been taken into account. The effect on Bruce was, that with him religious men stood low, while he himself felt very indifferent.

But an event now occurred which had the happy effect to wake into new activity Bruce's religious nature. The time had come when

he had to make choice of a calling, and to leave the home of his tender mother. His boyish heart was breaking within him, but he manfully concealed the fact. He chose the calling of carpenter, and the day was set when he should go to town to be bound as an apprentice for the next four years. His mother went with him. The indenture was drawn up and mutually signed, and Bruce Vance passed beyond the control of his mother. She parted from her youngest child with the heroism of a true woman. Not one sign of maternal weakness did she exhibit. She shed not a tear, nor dropped one word of regret. She felt that a look composed and firm, with a spirit strong and determined, would best impress her son on leaving him. She then gave him his father's Bible, which she had carefully kept for that purpose, and with it said: "My dear boy, remember your God, and read this; keep no evil company, and never go in debt." She silently kissed her child, and turned quickly away, for that iron will was on the eve of breaking. Bruce passed into his master's shop with a single wish, and that was that he slept with his venerated father.

Bruce's master, upon the whole, was a kind-hearted man, a skillful mechanic, but ignorant and covetous. His wife was a most estimable Christian woman, with a heart as tender as that of an infant. To her Bruce soon became perfectly devoted, while to him she was, if possible, more than a mother. He made rapid advances in his trade, was very industrious and perfectly dutiful; and hence soon acquired the name of the best boy in the town. His days were long and laborious; his nights very lonely and often sad. Indeed there was a slight tinge of melancholy running through Bruce's whole nature, which became very perceptible at times, and which served to color the whole of his after-life. To him it could hardly be pronounced a blessing; yet clearly it was not a misfortune. Under its influence his deportment was generally sedate, his look almost always sorrowful. He spent his long wakeful nights in reading, nor least of all his Bible. Indeed it would not be going too far to say he actually made the attempt to study it. His poor success, however, greatly discouraged him. To him truly it was a sealed book. This was in harmony both with the tenets of his father and with the preaching to which he was now listening. He read the Bible merely; but as for understanding it, this was impossible. He dared not even presume on such a thing. Hence his reading did not profit him.

Bruce's master cared nothing for religion, but spent his Sundays in the shop, drawing plans of houses and arranging work for the week. With his mistress, however, it was very different. She went regularly to church. In the course of time she had so won on the affections of Bruce that he was always ready to accompany her. Indeed, she had so far succeeded in reversing his judgment, that he was now willing to admit that there was at least one Christian who was not

a hypocrite. Her influence on his mind was most salutary. He even went so far as to feel an interest himself in Christianity, and to engage in frequent conversations with his mistress on it. His mind, however, still remained wholly dark, though he felt his heart sensibly softening. A short time only elapsed before his whole nature became enlisted. His temperament was intensely ardent; his energy, though quiet, was indomitable. Bruce Vance began to seek religion.

From the day on which his efforts began to that on which they ended was a period of seven full years. During all this time Bruce was just as miserable as it is possible for any human being to be. Alternate hope and despair swayed his breast. At times his anguish of soul seemed intolerable. On more occasions than one he felt that suicide would be the shortest road to the solution of the question which was breaking his heart. His early education had been thoroughly Calvinistic; and the question which now wrung his spirit was: Am I of the elect, or am I not. On this his mistress could give him no relief; on it her preacher could give him none. Bruce now became a constant attendant on preaching. It mattered not to what party the preacher belonged. With him questions of creed and questions of difference were not worth one moment's thought. The great question which lay on his mind and the solution of which he was daily seeking was the only one worth considering. If to this an answer was possible, that answer his soul must have. He talked with preachers, talked with laymen, talked with women; went to meeting far, to meeting near, to meeting by night, to meeting by day, but all to no effect. He prayed, prayed incessantly, prayed standing, prayed kneeling, prayed prostrate on the ground, prayed short prayers, prayed long prayers, prayed in a whisper, prayed aloud; prayed and then read, read and then prayed; sang and prayed, prayed and then sang, yet not one ray of comfort entered his bitter soul. Revival after revival he attended; protracted meeting after protracted meeting he went through, but all to no purpose. Night after night and day after day, he bowed over the mourner's bench, with all the devotion of a Muezzin, yet it brought him no peace. At times his despair was complete. He would then grow silent and melancholy. For weeks he would now do little more than secretly pray. This he never intermitted. In most of the experiences which Bruce heard, and he listened to all, voices were distinctly heard, or sights seen, as the token of the divine acceptance. These, therefore, of course, he expected to see, and hence sought them with all the earnestness of his fully awakened nature. In his prayers he would often pause and intently listen, hoping at every pulse that some miraculous rushing wind would sweep by and leave his soul in peace. At other times he would open his eyes and peer round, expecting some meteoric flash as a sign from God that he was not a castaway.

He looked for the Holy Ghost, for the Savior, for angels, yet he could see no sight, could hear no voice. "Surely," he said, "salvation is for everybody but me." Alike by preacher and servant-girl, for he consulted all, he was told to have faith. This he thought he had ; but they told him it was not the right kind. Away he now darted into the dark woods, and for whole hours would pray for the right kind of faith. He would experience no change. His agony was overwhelming. He now had a new source of trouble. "Give yourself up to God," others would say. But what did this mean ? Bruce could not see. Again he was off for prayer, muttering as he went : "Give myself up to God ; give myself up to God. Yes, I must, I can, I will." Down on his knees he would go to give himself up to God. He would call on God to have him, and then pause to see what would happen. Nothing would occur. Again despair was his mater. "You are keeping back something," would say some gruff predestinarian ; "there is some sin or idol you are not willing to part from. Otherwise you would find rest at once." And now Bruce would sit down to inspect his heart. He would search it, probe it, wring it, torture it ; but, alas, it availed nothing. "You are doing well," would ejaculate some silly old woman ; "the darkest hour is just before day. You will soon be through, I will warrant." Bruce's hopes would rise ; and on he would toil for another month, but still with no success. Thus passed days, months, years.

Some of the experiences which Bruce heard set him a long way forward, others a long way back. I will here jot down a few of these for the pleasure of the reader. They are selected at random from a whole volume full like them.

A large revival had just closed in the neighborhood, at which it seemed everybody could get through but Bruce. On the following regular meeting day, which was Saturday, the new converts were to relate their experiences. Among these were several which Bruce was exceedingly anxious to hear—some because of his confidence in the parties who were to relate them, others because of his want of it ; for already had he come to suspect that these experiences at times contained other elements than truth ; and more than this, he had come to suspect that his teachers might possibly at least be blind guides, and as deep in the ditch as himself. This suspicion marked the day of Bruce's deliverance. But that regular meeting day had come, and with it an immense concourse of people. Among those who were to recount their trials and their final deliverance from sin was an honest farmer named Lemuel Smiser. He was the neighborhood blacksmith and its justice of the peace ; and no better man could the county boast. Everybody had the utmost confidence in him. Bruce was especially anxious to hear his experience ; for he said in himself, all Lemuel Smiser tells will be true. He therefore drew near, and Lemuel began.

"Brethren," he said, "I have come forward after much hesitation to be examined by you. I am not sure that I am fit to come, but hope you will candidly judge of that. I have a very poor experience to give in, but as it is all I have I trust it will not be despised. I feel that I am a changed man. I love God, love Christ, and believe in him with all my heart. I believe the Bible, and wish to do all it commands me. I hate sin and wish to abandon it. I feel deeply penitent for my past life. I love all the children of God, and I should like to live with you, if you think me a converted man. This is all I have to say."

Leave was given to the members of the church to ask questions, if any so desired. No questions were asked. "Shall we give to Bro. Smiser the right hand of fellowship?" was now put to the church. Every member voted aye.

Bruce was struck and delighted with Lemuel's experience. He believed it every word. Indeed it was his own. All Lemuel had said he could have said, and that most truthfully. Is it possible, he said to himself, that I am actually a converted man, and did not know it? For an instant his soul glowed with joy, but he made no move.

Next came Miss Cynthia Cole. "I had long," she began, "been concerned about my soul; and had sought religion much, but could not find it? About two weeks ago I was going to old Mr. Jones's spring to get a pail of water. I had just crossed the bridge and turned down the branch when an angel stretched his bright wings across my path and stopped me. He then looked me kindly in the face and said: 'Cynthia, your sins are all forgiven;' and instantly he disappeared. This is my experience." "We never heard a better!" cried several voices, with evident delight. At once Cynthia was accepted.

Garret Green came next. He commenced by saying: "I first became concerned on the subject of religion about ten years ago. At times I was greatly troubled, but generally my troubles did not last long. Occasionally I would grow very indifferent. Then again my whole nature would become aroused. I prayed and read, and watched and waited, but never found any peace till about ten days ago. Last Thursday week I was in the field plowing old Bob; and the Devil and the Holy Ghost got after. They kept following me for several hours. I whipped up old Bob, and made him walk very fast. They still kept after me. When I would get to the end of the row, I would turn round very quickly and start back, thinking that the Devil and the Holy Ghost would keep on out in the woods, and let me alone. But it was no use. They still kept picking at me. At last I concluded to hide. So I went to a corner of the fence, and crawled along under the pea-vine till I got under the shade of a

hickory bush. I now lay perfectly still. Presently I heard the Holy Ghost say : ' Garret, Garret, where art thou ? ' Then I gave up. This is all I have to relate." " A bright manifestation," said the moderator. The whole church was delighted with Garret's tale, and at once voted him converted.

Bruce Vance became perfectly disgusted. He believed every word Lemuel Smiser had said ; but as for Cynthia Cole and Garret Green, he said in his heart : Your tales are arrant lies. Bruce was excited. He at once left the meeting, saying as he left : " I will never put foot inside of another meeting-house." This was hasty, and fortunately for him not strictly lived up to.

Bruce's whole soul now turned against religion. It became perfectly odious to him. " If these unblushing lies," he said, " be religion, away with it. If I have to become the retailer of vulgar romances to be a Christian, the question is settled—I will never be one." Three years thus passed over Bruce's head. His spirit was never at ease for a moment. Still he loathed religion. The tale of Cynthia Cole and Garret Green perpetually haunted him, particularly that of the latter. " The Devil and the Holy Ghost got after me," Bruce would sneeringly repeat. " Yes," he would add, " a part of your tale I believe. That the Devil was after you and still is, not for a moment do I doubt." Then Bruce would repeat : " Presently I heard the Holy Ghost say : ' Garret, Garret ! ' " " How," he would ask, " did the old Cretan know which it was that spoke to him ? He had already admitted that both the Devil and the Holy Ghost were after him. If ever he heard a voice, which I do not believe, he heard only that of his father. On this point I am clear."

Bruce now gave himself up to the reading of vicious books. With Universalism and infidelity he tried to satisfy the cravings of his still hungry soul. To his credit be it said these things never even so much as smutted his honest nature. At length, he dashed from him his evil books, and reopened his long-neglected Bible, which happily, amid all his troubles, he had never learned to doubt. That, however, was still a dark, dark book, and gave him no relief. But in another piece we will write more of Bruce.

THE Missouri River, in its course, deposits along its margin vast beds of sand. In these, during the summer, will spring up thousands of little cotton-woods. They soon grow very tall, and are very feeble. No tornado, however, can break them as long as they stand together. But when only one is left alone, even its own weight at once bows its head to the ground. So with many Christians. While in the crowd of their brethren they bear themselves well. But when left alone they soon lie low in the dust.

PRAYER.

I PROPOSE to write an article on the subject indicated by the single word which I have placed at the top of this page. A firm belief that the subject of prayer is not so well or so generally understood as it should be is my only apology, if an apology be thought necessary, for introducing it at this time to the attention of the courteous reader. I hold, furthermore, and think it proper to avow the fact right here, that that sacred composition, commonly known as the Lord's Prayer, is the pattern of all true prayer; and that to be ignorant of the full scope and meaning of the various petitions in this model prayer, is to be ignorant of the very nature and design of prayer generally. Oh, that men would, in point of brevity, if in nothing else, learn to imitate the dear Lord! O ye wordy petitioners, when will ye have done with your verbose, ostentatious, endless prayers! Have ye not read that men are not heard for their much speaking? Then why, if ye have any regard for the authority of the Lord, do ye make long prayers? But I anticipate. No wonder, however. My soul has been so sickened and my poor body so exhausted under the *regime* of those everlasting harangues falsely called prayers, that patience has well-nigh died in my heart. But I promise these gentry that, before I am done with this present writing, I will pay my respects to them fully. It is the purpose of this paper to deal more especially with the nature of prayer; and under this head to include not only the various acts of the soul in devotion, but also some of the things to be guarded against in prayer.

First, then, the nature of prayer. Prayer has been well defined, I know not by whom, the offering up of our desires to God, for things agreeable to his will, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. In harmony with this definition, Paul holds the following language in his letter to the Philippians: "In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God." Still more to our purpose are the words of John: "And this is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will he hears us; and if we know that he hears us, whatever we ask [according to his will], we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him."

Prayer is in itself a becoming acknowledgment of the all-sufficiency of God and of our dependence upon him. It is his appointed means to us—the enabling cause—by which we may obtain both temporal and spiritual blessings. He could, indeed, for aught we know, bless his creatures in another way; but this is not a question of what God

can do, but of what he does. Of one thing I am profoundly certain, namely, He will be inquired of, to do for man the things of which he stands in need. Prayer, then, is the act of an indigent creature seeking relief from the Fountain of mercy. A deep sense of impoverishment and want excites desire, and this heart-felt desire is the very essence of prayer. "One thing have I desired of the Lord," says the Psalmist, "that will I seek after." Prayer without desire is like an altar without a sacrifice; or, if there be a sacrifice, without the fire from heaven to consume it. When all our wants are satisfied, then will prayer be converted into praise. "I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness." Till then, Christians must live by prayer, and dwell much of their time at the mercy-seat. The learned inform us that the last analysis of the word prayer shows it to consist of two words which answer to our English words with and vow; and that, literally and primarily, it signifies a binding of ourselves to God in prayer, or with a vow. Within certain limitations and restrictions as it respects the heavenly Father, this binding may be called mutual—God and man uniting themselves in vows together. God promising that, upon certain conditions to be complied with on our part, he will grant certain blessings.

The word also means to pour out, pour out vows to God, in allusion to the offerings or libations anciently poured out upon the altar at the time of prayer. The ancient worshiper, conscious of his guilt, brought an offering to make atonement, and with his offering joined a prayer to God that it might be accepted. So, then, prayer is something more than mere words, even though the words spring from the heart. Sacrifice must ever accompany prayer, for sacrifice is to prayer, I repeat, what fire was to the altar. In prayer, prayer that avails anything, we offer Jesus, our victim, to God as an atonement for our past sins. And then we offer ourselves, as living sacrifices, holy, acceptable to God, which is our reasonable service. Giving ourselves away to God as literally and fully, to be used by him, as did the Jew give up his victim, and as freely as he poured out its blood upon the altar. This is prayer; nothing else is.

The nature of prayer, therefore, seems to be that of covenant and sacrifice. Covenant as it respects God; sacrifice as it respects ourselves. This teaches us clearly what we ought to pray for. As we have entered into covenant with God and given ourselves up to him in sacrifice, our first prayer now, as before our covenant relations existed, or at least before they were consummated by obedience to his authority, will be: Lord, what wilt thou have us to do? About the first thing we fairly and clearly realize is, that God our Father has a work for all his children to do. And why not? Why should not this fact be the very first to press itself upon our attention? All the work there is to be done this side of the final judgment must be done by the

children of God ! Positively, there is not one moment to be lost ! The building of churches, the founding of colleges, the education of the people, the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the ordinances, the printing and dissemination of Bibles and religious literature, must all be done by men.

Since time began, the Lord has not of himself alone built a church, founded a college, taught letters, preached the gospel, administered the ordinances, or printed and disseminated Bibles and other literature. And what a lesson is taught us here ! We do not, as Christians, always choose our own pursuits in life. We do not fly in the face of Providence, and then labor and reason with God and conscience to satisfy them that we are right.

But first of all, bringing our sacrifice to the altar, we will pray God to direct us in the way in which he sees we ought to go. The sacrifice will most probably consist in a cheerful and hearty acquiescence in the appointments of his will. I firmly believe that God will direct the humble and sincere Christian in the way in which he can accomplish most good. In that way let him walk, and in that vineyard let him work. Let not men, on the one hand, try to run away from God and their appointed work, as did Jonah ; or, on the other, seek to thrust themselves into places and employments where they are not needed. Both alike will live and die unblessed. Some men, under a mistaken sense of duty, go lame and blind through life. Others, with equal obduracy, pass their pilgrimage in one unceasing struggle with conscience and the obvious indications of Providence. Is it your duty to preach the gospel ? Perhaps it is your duty not to preach it ; but then I am supposing a case.

Is it, then, your duty to preach the gospel ? Why, now, do you expect God to hear one solitary petition till you begin your work ? This is the cause of your spiritual leanness and barrenness. God is not hearing your prayers. Or, rather, you are not praying at all ! Of course, you imagine that you are a praying man ; but then you are practically living a prayerless life. Tell me, my brother, has not your life as a Christian been a failure ? Is it not one dreary, dead blank ; unfruitful alike as it respects your own good and happiness and the good and happiness of others ? Wake up, my brother ; in the name of the Master, wake up, and betake yourself to some employment for Christ, with an earnestness that shall prove a sure guarantee of your success ! Or is it your duty to do more pecuniarily for the cause of Christ ? Is your conscience exactly easy on the question of your former stewardship ? Do you expect, then, to prosper as a Christian till you have discharged this duty ? You never will, whatever you may think. As a man of the world, and in the things of the world, you may ; but as a Christian you never will. You must show God, I speak after the manner of men, that you are in earnest about

fulfilling your part of the covenant and making your full share of the sacrifice. Whenever this is done, and done faithfully, you may expect the Father to astonish you with the glorious fullness and richness of his blessings. "Will a man rob God? Yet you have robbed me. But you say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. You are cursed with a curse; for you have robbed me, even this whole nation. Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be food in my house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of Hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it. And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the Lord of hosts. And all nations shall call you blessed; for you shall be a delightful land, saith the Lord of hosts." Has God ever thus been "proved" by any people? Now I am simple enough to believe that if God were so proved by the whole world, or even by the so-called Christian world, that all this picture would be realized. That there would be neither war, pestilence, nor famine till the end of time.

But once more. Having received our allotted work from the Father, we must pray for grace to perform it. And by the word grace I mean all that is implied in the word favor; by which, again, I mean disposition, heart, enthusiasm, opportunity, etc. I hold it to be a settled fact that God will do nothing for us that we can do for ourselves. We know this to be true with reference to things temporal. Can any man show that it is not equally true when applied to things spiritual? Prayer and enlightened conscience are powers in this world. They hold thousands of men at their work who would else abandon it. A praying man will never abandon his work. A praying man will never backslide. Prayer will fan the coals upon the altar of his heart into a living flame, as with the breath of the Lord. "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing psalms."

I will now notice briefly some of the acts of the soul in devotion before God. These acts are various, and may be classified thus: 1. Invocation, or the act of addressing in prayer. 2. Adoration, or the act of paying honors to Jehovah. 3. Confession, or the act of the acknowledgment of our sins. 4. Petition, or the act of formal supplication to God. 5. Intercession, or the act of interceding with God in behalf both of ourselves and others. 6. Pleading, or the act of offering in defense; supporting by arguments and reasons. 7. Dedication, or the act of consecrating to God, or to a sacred use; solemn appropriation. 8. Thanksgiving, or the act of rendering thanks, or expressing gratitude for favors and mercies. 9. Blessing, or the act of praising or extolling the name of God; wishing honor, glory, reward; benediction.

I do not dogmatically assert that these are all the acts of the soul in prayer ; nor that I have made the best possible classification and arrangement of them. But I do assert that the various acts here indicated are sufficiently exhaustive and comprehensive ; and, moreover, that they are based upon the divine model. Now let any man pray with an intelligent appreciation of this chart before his mind, and he will at once perceive the difference between praying according to the word of the Lord, and like a blinded pugilist striking out wildly and beating the air. But as I do not intend to exhaust, but only to suggest, I will now pass to a consideration of some things to be guarded against in prayer.

Our Savior mentions particularly three things as being especially objectionable and offensive. And first in the list he places hypocrisy. "When you pray be not as the hypocrites are ; for they love to pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say to you, they have their reward." I need not inform the scholar that hypocrite is a Greek word, and means to assume to be what one is not ; a dissembler ; one who assumes a false appearance. Literally, the actor on the stage is a hypocrite, though not in the bad sense that attaches to the word when used in a religious sense. He assumes to be Macbeth, when we know that he is plain Peter Thompson ; his hypocrisy, therefore, is harmless. But not so when a man is religiously a hypocrite. Now the sin of these Pharisees consisted in the fact of their assuming to pray to God, whereas they were only praying to men. And as when out of sincere hearts we pray to God we have our reward from him, so when we pray to men we have our reward from them. We bid for their applause, and we get it. Verily, what a reward ! But there is still another phase to this question of hypocrisy in prayer. Some persons try to pray themselves into an agony. They make a prodigious effort to work up the emotional nature. They sometimes assume to feel a great deal, and to be wondrously wrought upon by some abstract or extraneous power, whereas they are really cheating none but themselves. Poor silly creatures ! They seem not to know that of all the calm, measured, temperate addresses this side of heaven, a prayer should be the very type of them all. Any other style may be properly enough denominated ranting, howling, or bunkum ; but it is certainly not prayer. I repeat, in prayer we should be calm—not dull and inane,—temperate, and dignified. When praying before men we should stand perfectly still, with the head slightly bowed, and scrupulously avoid all gesticulation. And then our thoughts should be clothed in the most chaste and simple language within our power to use. Other necessary concomitants will naturally suggest themselves to the intelligent mind, and it is, therefore, needless to add more on this head.

The second thing against which our Savior guards us is dissipation of mind while engaged in prayer. "When thou prayest, enter into thy closet ; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father who is in secret. And thy Father, who sees in secret, shall reward thee openly." Now nothing can be plainer than this. Comparatively but few men, and I grieve to say it, ever pray before the public ; but they are by no means absolved from private prayer, whatever may be said of more public duties. Consequently, the Savior here lays down a rule to govern all men in prayer, the preacher as well as the private Christian. We are to avoid the sight and sound of everything that is calculated to divide the mind or distract the thoughts. We would desire a clear mind in addressing the throne of an earthly monarch ; how much more when we address the Lord of lords and King of kings !

I know of nothing more offensive to my spirit than distraction and tumult while engaged in prayer. Especially is this true with reference to family and social prayer. The family should have a stated time to come together for prayer, just as the church does. All business and domestic duties should for the time be laid aside. Every servant and inmate of the family should be summoned and required to attend, and then reverently, humbly, and cheerfully all should engage in the worship. Let the service be so spiced with variety and interest as not to pall upon the spiritual appetite. Our enjoyment of the prayer meeting in the church has often been destroyed in consequence of the brutal and inexcusable vulgarity of some in attendance, and—shall I say it?—even of some members. During prayer some will stand and gaze listlessly and indifferently around. Others, with sharpened and eager vision, will apparently be engaged in a desperate effort to ascertain who is present. Others will yawn till they can be heard over the whole house ; which performance invariably produces a giggle and titter from all the young people present. Others will occasionally expectorate on the floor with such energy as to make one fairly bounce with fright. And others still, some preachers among them, will be constantly employed in turning and rustling the leaves of hymn-books, seeking for a hymn most probably, just as though the great Author of life were not being addressed ! Oh, my dying fellow mortals, let me plead with you to forsake all these wicked ways ! If even the angels veil their faces when addressing the Father, with what reverence, humility, and awe ought ye to come into his presence !

The third evil against which the Savior guards us in prayer is vain repetitions. "When you pray use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do ; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking. Be you not, therefore, like to them ; for your Father knoweth what things you have need of before you ask him." Now, I will unhesi-

tatingly affirm that no other command of our Lord Jesus Christ, a command, too, joined with an example, is so frequently and so utterly disregarded as the one which I have just transcribed. It is not often that the Savior accompanies his commands with arguments and explanations ; but when he does, we may be sure that the circumstance is pregnant with meaning. Well, now, it is a significant fact that the Lord has not explained, argued, illustrated, and enforced any other Christian duty to the same extent to which he has prayer, or with anything like the same degree of fullness. And the evils that have followed this almost universal disregard of the solemn instructions of the Savior of sinners can scarcely be calculated. With watch in hand I have tested the question many times, and the following is about the result of my investigations : Out of twenty prayers, twelve were fifteen minutes long, three were ten minutes in length, and the remaining five ranged from three to nine minutes. And then the subject-matter of these prayers ! Absolutely it is a disgrace to the civilization and religious culture of the nineteenth century even to speak of it. My cheek burns with shame merely to think of it. The subject-matter of our prayers is nearly always bad enough, in all conscience ; but when this matter is repeated five or six times in one prayer, it is simply intolerable. The truth is, that thousands of men who pray before the public never think of what they are to say. They do not think enough of the subject of prayer generally to be impressed with the necessity of varying their petitions. It is with them a sort of slipshod performance that demands no anxious thought or care. Prayer is of the intellect as well as of the heart. The Savior, not only in his model, but in his instructions as well, clearly indicates an intellectual exercise. He says : "After this manner, therefore, pray ye." The force of the original does not appear in the translation, as will be seen at a glance : "*Οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς.*" The fact is apparent that the Savior was never more specific in any commandment.

Now let us sketch, with great brevity, some of the positive evils that grow out of the habit of long, elaborate, and ornate prayers. And first, the practice has a direct tendency to deter modest but uninstructed men from engaging in public prayer. They have, from all that they have heard, come to regard prayer as a species of finished declamation and oratory. To their simple minds prayer is an intellectual exercise, for the display of literary attainments. It is, to their comprehension, a mysterious performance, deeply involved in the meshes of rhetoric. They have heard preachers and bishops employ metaphors in prayer, and they know nothing of metaphors. They have heard them quote Greek and Latin, and they know themselves to be innocent of any such accomplishments. They have heard them recite whole pages of Milton, Pollok, Shakspeare, and Young, not to

say Byron, whereas their own poetical readings have been confined to David, Job, and the hymn-book ; and, of course, these poets would not appear well in such respectable company. Now, if these humble, unassuming men had nothing before their minds but such specimens of prayer as are commended by the Lord himself, scarcely one out of a hundred would refuse to pray. Were brethren of this class permitted to attend a prayer meeting composed of Jesus, Peter, John, James, Matthew, and some dozen other church dignitaries that might be mentioned, they would not hesitate for one moment to engage in prayer with them. Is the heart of the Master sorrowful, even unto death ? Then we hear him pray : " O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me ; nevertheless, not my will, but thy will be done." Is the successorship of the traitor-apostle to be supplied ? Then we hear the apostle pray : " Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all, show which of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." Contrast this simple performance and single prayer of fifteen seconds with the heathenish mummeries of a modern " consecration," and you will be able to see in some measure how closely the " only successors of the apostles" imitate the divinely appointed originals ! Who does not feel that he could pray in such company ? Instead of two or three men occupying the whole time allotted to the prayer meeting, a dozen men might employ their gifts in devotional exercises. And were the divine rule rigidly observed, a dozen brethren would be found willing to bear a part in the service of God, where one can not now be prevailed upon to do so. Another evil, directly traceable to the same cause, is a diminishing of general interest in prayer. The majority of people have come to look upon what is popularly called prayer as something rather to be endured than enjoyed. And the writer hereof confesses to sharing largely in this feeling. As a striking example of this everlasting and universal prolixity, observe the manner in which the great majority of men offer thanks (?)—save the mark !—for the emblematic loaf and wine. I have carefully noted the style in which this duty is usually performed, and scruple not to say that I have never yet seen it properly done, excepting in a single instance, and that was on the part of a plain old farmer. Next Sunday, when you rise to officiate at the Lord's table, ask that brother preacher present, who is a graduate of some college, to offer thanks for the loaf ; and at once he will launch his bark on the ocean of prayer, and he will pray for everything and everybody, but as for offering thanks, why, he never thinks of such a thing. What right has he to keep the people standing full five minutes to hear him pray, when I politely requested him to offer thanks ?

Another evil growing out of the long-prayer system is lack of uni-

formity in posture during prayer. Suppose we kneel. Very well ; if our knee-caps were made of iron I should not object. But as I am not a superstitious Papist, but, I hope, a reasonably intelligent Christian, I decidedly object to punishing and torturing my body for some supposed benefit that will thereby accrue to my soul. Suppose we stand. Well, I am willing to try every way ; but I do not see that this helps matters one whit. Standing perfectly still, as we ought always to do in prayer, is a severe ordeal for the stoutest man, to say nothing of delicate ladies. But Bro. Prosy says : Let us pray ; and immediately every one reverently rises. Now watch them. Their intentions are good. Their desires are worthy. Their religious impulses are in the right direction. But flesh and blood are not proof against everything. At first they all assume an exceedingly devotional attitude and demeanor. They evidently desire and intend to maintain such attitude and demeanor all the way through to the amen. For the first ten minutes they endure it bravely. But now one hand goes down on the top of the pew, to support the aching back ; now a foot is shifted, and the burden thereby thrown from one exhausted limb to the other ; then a furtive glance is cast at the author of all this misery, but as he has just reached China in his devotional excursion round the world there is but little comfort to be gained in that quarter. Human nature can stand it no longer, and Sister A, aged seventy-two, sits down. " Good ! " says Sister B, aged twenty-four, " as Sister A has taken her seat, I will do the same." And now they go down, down, down, all over the house, till only three or four stout young men, who are fully determined not to be beaten, are left standing. How many prayer meetings have thus been ruined by well-meaning but injudicious brethren !

But, finally, I am asked : How much time should be occupied in prayer ? I should say, as a general rule, from one to two minutes. Certainly never over two minutes ; rather let it be under one than over two minutes in length. And how much time will you allow us for the offering of thanks ? From fifteen to twenty-five seconds ; but rather fall below the fifteen than go beyond the twenty-five. Should we study our prayer ? By all means. Whenever you go to the prayer or any other kind of meeting, where there is a probability of your being called upon to pray, let a single thought engross your mind and heart. Turn it over and over in your mind, ponder and ponder it in your heart ; and then with gratitude, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, present your prayer to God. Or, if you adopt the exact model of the Lord's prayer, you can make a prayer sufficiently comprehensive to embrace everything that a Christian ought to pray for in less than one minute. I can most reverently and measuredly repeat the Lord's prayer in forty seconds. But some private Christians are like some elders and preachers, namely, they must say every-

thing that is to be said every time they attempt either to preach or pray. Said a brother to me a few Sundays since, as we were walking home from morning service : " Why did you not elaborate and dwell much longer on a certain point, naming it, this morning ? " " Oh ! " said I, " I expect to preach here again to-night, next Sunday morning and night, and probably all the Sunday mornings and nights of my life. " This incident will fully illustrate my meaning. Let one brother make a comprehensive and exhaustive prayer, like the Lord's prayer ; let another follow with a special petition for the prosperity of their particular congregation ; let another pray for peace, another for the sick, another for the bereaved, another for the success of the gospel, etc., etc. But when you are in the privacy of your own closet, fall down or kneel down before the Lord of hosts, and there pour out your heart before him. As we say, unbosom yourself before his presence. Let your full heart, with all its secret experiences, trials, and longings, like a mountain stream, take its own course. But always remember, my dear brother or sister in Christ, that private griefs, and private wants, and private experiences, are for the privacy of the closet, unless you are very confident that you could make one or more of them subserve a good purpose by bringing them before the public.

I have often been pained and shocked by witnessing exhibitions before the thoughtless, the giddy, and the worldling, that ought to have been reserved for the eye of God alone. But let us never forget that, while in a certain sense prayer is of the intellect, it is pre-eminently of the heart. Let us never degenerate into mere lifeless formalism, but strive to make the house of prayer the most charming spot on earth. I believe that a prayer meeting indicates with almost infallible accuracy, like the scale of a thermometer, the spiritual temperature of the church. And this is one of the reasons why I seek to divest it of all that can hurt or mar. " Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty to utter anything before God ; for God is in heaven and thou upon the earth, therefore let thy words be few. " In a succeeding number I may have something to say concerning the practical benefits of prayer. For the present, God's benison upon you all !

W.

REFRESHING FROM MISSOURI.—At no former period in the history of Missouri has the cause been so prosperous as now, and this notwithstanding the diminished number of her preachers. Could she only at present command the labors of her former noble band, now scattered, but still in most cases anxious to return, how soon a State could be taken for the Master ! Could not our brethren there, by proper effort, bring this event to pass ? Long years to come would reveal the wisdom of such a step. Try it, brethren.

ODDS AND ENDS.

THE caption of this article intimates an intention on the part of the writer to pursue no subject regularly through ; but to notice, irregularly and without any necessary connection, a number of topics thought to be of practical importance to the church. "Gather up the fragments that nothing be lost," is an injunction as prudential in the spiritual as it is in physical economy. It is my design, then, to notice some of the little things—things so little as often to escape our attention; and as I propose to be both irregular and even abrupt in the transition from one thought to another, you will not be surprised if I begin at once right in the midst of things. I say in the midst, for what is there in the church more central, both as to position and as to its importance, than the Lord's Supper? And what can be of more importance than a proper manner of observing it? There are many pieces of music which, when sung with proper taste, accent, time, and spirit, are most exquisite ; but when drawled out, with none of these concomitants, they greatly misrepresent both the merits of the piece and the talent of the author. Bro. Filmore ought to get out a warrant for a certain class of singers who every Sunday crucify afresh his "Iowa," and his "Glorious Land." Their cruelty is manifested not only in the tasteless and accentless way of torturing the poor creatures, but in their protracting the torment, hastening along so leisurely, and not paying the least attention to their dying groans and agonies heard all through the performance. It is different with "Old Hundred." It can endure pounding all day and not be hurt. A tough old tune, that can not be worn out. You may beat it upon the drum-head, beat it upon the banjo, and even expose it to the murderers of "Iowa," and yet will he survive.

As it is with some finely composed music, so with church ordinances, and especially the Lord's Supper. Their proper effect depends almost wholly upon a proper observance of them. What, then, are the prevailing defects in this observance. They are three in number :

1. Some churches, especially in the country, prepare their table with a sort of bar-room furniture—a glass bottle with a long neck, a couple of glass tumblers, and a couple of cheap plates. Now I grant there is no chapter and verse against this ; but the feeblest dictates of good taste and a very moderate sense of propriety would suggest the necessity of securing a decent communion service, to prevent the tavern and bar-room associations suggested by such unbecoming furniture.

2. Neither is there any chapter and verse forbidding the deacons, after having served the congregation, to stand beside the table and help themselves, first to the bread, and then to the wine. I do not believe that any deacon will be shut out of the kingdom of heaven for doing so, nor that the preacher must stand on the left for suggesting no better order ; but I do believe that if the deacons would always take their seats on their return to the table and let whoever serves at the table serve them, it would look a great deal better. No matter how devotional the deacons may be at the moment of helping themselves to the wine, I never could resist the bar-room association that the habit suggests.

3. The habit some members have of taking seats so as to render it inconvenient for the deacons to wait on them, having to pick them out from among the congregation, together with a sort of irreverence they sometimes manifest, is an unmistakable discount on the solemnities and religious effect of this ordinance. Observing this rite, as we do, every Lord's day, the members ought always to sit together, in the middle seats, or manage in some other way to save the damage too often suffered for want of a little better order. I acknowledge myself not very well pleased with our order in many places in celebrating the one great wonder of the world.

There are four ceremonies in which ministers are often called upon to take a part, and as to the right performance of which, from the day I felt myself to be an humble minister of Christ, I have never ceased to be sensitive—baptism, a funeral service, a marriage ceremony, and the Lord's Supper ; as if a blunder, an instance of bad taste, would very much vitiate the ceremony.

The reader will observe no tendency in the writer of this article to shun the use of the personal pronoun *I*. This habit may be in bad taste. It is generally supposed to smack of egotism, and hence some writers, especially editors, think to shun its use by substituting *we*. But it always seemed to me to be more pretentious to try to make out oneself to be more than one by the use of the plural, than just to acknowledge himself a single individual. Solomon says two are better than one ; and this may be the reason why some writers always choose the plural, thinking themselves equal to two at least. You will all remember that passage in which Paul beautifully and modestly says : " When we were a child, we thought as a child, we spake as a child, we understood as a child ; but when we became a man, we put away childish things." This paragraph, however, you may look upon as one of the odds, or one of the ends, while I pass on to another.

The school children have all read about Diogenes walking through the city one bright day with a lighted candle in his hand hunting a man. He was not looking for an *anthropos*, simply a human being,

but for an *aneer*, for a man emphatically—not only for a male of our species, but for a man of principle, intelligence, of force, but above all of *executiveness*. The old philosopher, cynic though he was, deserves a vote of thanks from us for thus italicising a great want felt by every community until this day. This is the special want of every church in the land. Congregations sometimes have ministers who by no means fill the description. A minister, though only a monthly visitant to a church, who knows not the number of members in the congregation, who after a half dozen visits does not personally know every member, who never in company with the elders looks over the list to know the condition of each one, who never takes up the delinquent list himself nor urges the elders to visit them immediately, who never asks the young members privately about their habits of private devotion, who never prays in a family except when he happens to stay all night, who does not correct the bad habits above-named in reference to the Lord's Supper is not the one Diogenes looked for. Such a preacher is nothing but an *anthropos* and no *aneer*. Some of them lack the industry and driving force to do the work ; some lack the mental force and personal courage necessary to get things in order, and others lack the heart that “naturally cares for their state.”

The whole system of monthly preaching, copied from the Methodists and Baptists, stands in more need of a revision than King James's translation does. It will require a “Bible Union,” too, embracing all the friends of revision and a good deal of money to make the necessary changes. We must also re-examine all the manuscripts and recensions of the text to see if we have not some spurious habits among us that need to be expunged. If by the aid of the Bible Union revision, and Anderson's revision, and all other accessible helps, we can revise our ecclesiastical habits, it will be a happy thing for us. My opinion is, that when that revision is begun we will fail to find authority in any manuscript, ancient or modern, for our monthly preaching, for neglecting pastoral labor in country churches, for neglecting to assemble on every first day, and for many other habits that we Bible people alone have established.

The evils arising from our system of monthly preaching may be laid partly to the charge of the churches and partly to that of ministers. Of the latter I have already spoken. The main fault of the churches consists in not affording a sufficient support to enable their ministers to devote their whole time among them. We do not urge each church to sustain a minister the whole of his time, for if they were all both able and willing to do this, the men are not to be found. We might find one pastor for every two churches, and these, if not very far apart, could be kept in a growing condition continually by any pious, active preacher, by his preaching and visiting, and private

instruction ; by Sunday schools, by prayer meetings, and by his own godly walk going in and out before all the people. I will only call attention to this matter at present to suggest the entire practicability of two churches, or even three, being kept alive and growing by the undivided labors of one good man. But let the churches have a full understanding with the preacher that he is to work through the week as well as on Sundays, in the way just indicated, having no need to labor to make a part of his living abroad, and not five years will have passed until a most visible and sensible improvement will be seen all over the land.

To effect all this, and many other good things we have in view for the churches, we must have more "assembling of ourselves together" in annual meetings, in districts and counties. We must, every year, encourage the churches in each county to come together to enjoy a good old-fashioned "annual meeting," where we can form religious acquaintance with each other, exhort one another, confer about the general interest of the Kingdom, and not depend upon a State meeting, held once a year, where not one in a thousand can ever attend. We must come at the "whole multitude of the disciples," and make all feel that we are one people committed to the one great enterprise of saving the souls of men. Besides these things, the churches of each county will readily agree to report, at their annual meetings, what they will do for the missionary cause the following year—each county, perhaps, supporting a missionary—they will hear what their previous years' liberality did, thank God, take courage, and go on.

There is a certain sermon going the rounds made rather famous by the number of preachers, in certain districts, who deliver it. It seems to be based on some cabalistic virtue discovered in the number three. There are three that bear record in heaven, and three that bear record on earth. Also, there are faith, hope, and love, these three. Here, then, are three threes named in Scripture—very significant this. There must be more of them. There may be something very instructive in this sacred number. Let us see. And now they set out to see how many threes they can find. Well, in the first place, there are three facts of the gospel to be believed ; three commands to be obeyed, and three promises to be enjoyed ; three elements in man—body, soul, and spirit ; three worlds—heaven, earth, and hell. These five other sets of threes make eight threes. I do not mean to spoil this innocent conceit of cabalism in this remarkable number, by suggesting that Paul names five facts instead of three to be believed—his death, burial, resurrection, appearance to witnesses, and ascension ; nor to break the illusion by reminding our three-ideaed preachers that there are four instead of three commands to be obeyed—to hear, to believe, to repent, and to be baptized ; for it is my intention rather to help them to a few other sets of threes, which, when

incorporated into their sermons will make them more mysterious. Now, it is a fact not to be ignored, that every triangle has three angles and also three sides. Then there are three degrees of comparison—the positive, comparative, and superlative. There are also three zones—the torrid, the temperate, and the frigid. Three geological formations—the primary, the secondary, and tertiary. And, theologically, there are three heavens—the first, the second, and the third heaven. Three hells—limbo, purgatory, and hell proper. Then, approaching the domestic circle, there is man, woman, and babe, three more ; but what shall I say more, for the time would fail me to tell of the patriarchal, the Jewish, and Christian Dispensations ; to note the beginning, the middle, and the end ; and collate everything that would deepen for our preachers the mystery of three ? And, strange to say, after all their partiality for three, they are unwilling to be called trinitarians.

This odd paragraph may, after all, reach round to the previous one concerning the revival and improvement of our churches, for nothing is less likely to beget a pentecostal season than a sermon on these same threes. Just think of a man ransacking the Bible for threes, and then asking them to “come forward” for that. The reader will understand, I hope, that this sermon is burlesqued as a representative of a whole class of sermons that are destitute of all grace. There is that sermon repeated by so many, whose burden is to prove that there is something in a name. Of course, it must tell about the old lady shouting, “Glory to Beelzebub !” and about Mrs. Brown bringing her sectarian husband to his senses, by refusing one day to be called by his name and assuming temporarily a new name. All this is well enough in its place, if used sparingly ; still, no one ever went to the insane asylum from religious excitement under such sermons. The church has had no preaching for a month. Some have already grown cold, and careless, and prayerless. Others are hungering for a word of comfort or encouragement. Their inward prayer is : “Oh ! for a closer walk with God.” Others have backslidden, and may well mourn with Cowper :

“Where is the blessedness I knew,
When first I sought the Lord ?
Where is the soul-reviving view
Of Jesus and his word ?
What peaceful hours I once enjoyed !
How sweet their memory still !
But they have left an aching void,
The world can never fill.”

But here comes our preacher ; he will help us up into a better state. He is in the pulpit ; he rises to preach. He shows the difference between moral and positive law, proves that faith precedes repentance, denounces the creeds, scolds the church, and gives an in-

vation. Nobody comes forward, and nobody ought to come. The weak are not strengthened, nor are the disconsolate comforted, nor do the weary find rest for their souls, but go home "hungry and faint and poor." If any one needs to come forward, it is the preacher himself, who should be kept on the anxious seat till he knows more about religion himself, and is able to break the bread of life to every hungry soul. I would not insinuate that such preachers are representatives of our ministry, but there are a few such who remind us that we are not yet in a world where "the spirits of the just are made perfect."

Made perfect! This reminds me of something else. A brother minister to-day told me of a church that was about employing a preacher for the coming year at the rate of three hundred dollars for a fourth of his time. Another one let them understand that he would accept two hundred and fifty dollars, while a third offered to take two hundred dollars. This underbidding is sufficiently base. I would just here advise the churches never to employ a man of so little principle as to go about underbidding other ministers. I know there is only one in a thousand that would condescend to do such a thing, but always let that one feel the unworthiness of his course.

What an unworthy habit a few unscrupulous principals of colleges and academies have fallen into in vacation time,—the habit of underbidding other schools to draw away those who have already promised their patronage! This is not only unchristian, but very ungentlemanly. The moment you call upon a family for their patronage and find they have already promised another school, desist from the conversation. Do as you would be done by. One teacher, known to me, boasts that he can, "in half an hour's talk," bring them to his school, no matter whom they have promised. A foul art that. Let parents and guardians always distrust the man that so approaches them. He lacks in moral principle, and can not look those in the face who know him. He is not fit to have charge of your sons, especially of your daughters.

Cheap preaching and cheap teaching, how often they are furnished by a cheap sort of men, who, simply because they are cheap men, seldom enjoy the best respects of those who employ them. This remark, of course, is not intended for young men of high principles who have not yet established themselves, nor benevolent men who volunteer their services for the needy at a small compensation, but for the under-bidders, the supplanters, and for cheap men generally. If those school districts who employ cheap teachers, under the impression that it is an economical way of educating their children, would count up what they lose by bad teaching, imperfect mental training, the consequent loss of the pupil's time, injurious habits of study, and all the evils springing from their penny-wise and pound-foolish economy, they would soon discover the impolicy of such a course. Teachers imper-

fectly qualified for their work, either as to their education or natural tact for the work, are paralleled by no class of men so fairly as by ministers of indifferent grace ; for the latter are as incapable of leading the congregation to high attainments in religious life as the mere arithmetician is of instructing his pupils in the elements of higher mathematics. Every minister should understand Christianity subjectively ; that is, as to its effect upon his own and others' hearts better than those whom he undertakes to instruct. He should "know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge." He should be able to say with Paul, "Nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me ; the life that I now live, I live by the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me." With this subjective knowledge of God, he can lead others to the richer experiences of God's grace and love, can meet the wants of longing hearts, can feed those who hunger after righteousness, and guide them to the fountain of the water of life. How can he teach others to pray unless he loves to pray himself. Ignorance of the love of God in the religious teacher is as hostile to his real success with the hearts of others as is the lack of harmony in the soul of him who would inspire songs. Still this richness of soul is not always found with those who refuse to under-bid another ; what I insist upon is, that the churches should always prefer the minister of deep experience in religious things, whether he be an old man or a young one, whether he be as eloquent as Aaron or as slow as Moses,—for a sort of religious tenderness and mellow-heartedness are indispensable to his usefulness.

This suggests another thought : the condition of the heart modifies the action of the intellect. A pure, good heart clears up the judgment. Paul says, on a certain occasion : "I give my judgment, and I think that I have the Spirit of Jesus Christ," which shows that, although inspiration is disclaimed in the case, yet the sanctified state of his affections was considered by him as determining his judgment. I think it will easily be conceded that a heart beclouded with sin will induce a certain opacity of perception, especially when applied to spiritual things. This is more than intimated in some not very religious men in their want of fine spiritual discernment as to the proprieties due to certain religious occasions. Thus I have seen Baptists about to immerse a believer in the sacred emblem, going tentatively into the water and acting too robustly to suit a delicate taste. I have seen them walk about in the water altogether too manfully, as much as to say, Who cares for water ? Then I have seen the action performed so rapidly or suddenly as to discount no little the solemnity of the scene. Now it would be unfair always to attribute these and such like improprieties to an indifferent condition of the heart ; for sometimes it is due to a want of intellectual culture, or to a naturally coarse organization ; but a lack of spiritual discernment in these

cases is easily distinguishable from that which arises from a lack of religious sensitiveness.

"O Lord, have mercy upon my good works!" cried a good old man, some years ago, when about to close a long and useful life. It is natural enough to pray for mercy upon our bad works, but it is rather singular to ask mercy for our good works. Yet these words contain, not only a sound philosophy, but a rich experience in the things of God; for not only are we sometimes guilty of such improprieties as are above-named, but often, as Bro. A. Campbell used to say: "Our purest thoughts and our holiest actions need the pardoning blood of Christ." Such a conception indicates both a deep perception of the holiness of God and of the imperfection of our worship, and tends to make one humble, tender, and impressible with the smallest inelegancy in the house of the Lord.

But here my jottings ought to close for the present. I have been, all through this article, on the blind side of humanity, noting their faults; but in my next I will be on the other side, and will try to show by odds and ends, how much unchronicled goodness there is in the world,—goodness that is never seen in public print, nor inscribed upon the tombstone, and that never will be fully known and rewarded till the day that God shall judge the secrets of men's hearts. To a superficial thinker, and even to deep thinkers, the evil in this world may seem to predominate wholly over the good; but my impression is, that we are not, as a world, so nearly bankrupt as many suppose. A fair statement of our assets has never yet been made, and, to do ourselves justice, I will try to bring up some of our credits, which I think the Lord himself will recognize.

DIIDYMUS.

PUT HIM AWAY.—"In very recent rationalistic works, among which we class *Ecce Homo*—the greatest boon that we have received in religious literature for years,—we have marvelously fine exhibitions of true humanity." This eulogy of a daring infidel work, now having its run, is from the pen of Calvin Reasoner, who, a little before Alexander Campbell slept his last sleep, stooped to the office of slandering his name and memory. "*Ecce Homo*—the greatest boon that we have received in religious literature for years." We do not wonder at this loud praise. Alexander Campbell was the sublime friend of the Bible, and always defended it; *Ecce Homo* is its subtle enemy, and seeks to subvert it. Calvin Reasoner traduces the former, and eulogizes the latter. Birds of a feather love one another, and therefore should be together. Let the church to which he belongs put him away, and no other give him shelter till he repent and retract. The sooner the church of Jesus Christ is free from all such men the better for it.

THE THREE MODES.

It will not be denied that Jesus Christ commanded certain characters to be baptized ; and since it is equally certain that the Lord has connected with the compliance some certain blessings of his kingdom which can not be secured without it ; and since no one can feel certain that he has the blessings who does not intelligently see that he has complied with the condition upon which its enjoyment depends, and since no one can thus see who does not distinctly understand what it is to be baptized, it follows that it is important, to the full extent of the value of the blessings contingent upon the compliance with the sacred command, that we should know what the command is. True, if the blessings be estimated at a small price, our interest in knowing what the condition of them is will be small.

If we should conclude that the only value of baptism is to let us into some visible church ; that without it we are, or may be, in something, thought to exist, called the invisible church, which is held to be the only very essential thing, then, of course, we will give ourselves but little trouble to know what duty was enjoined by the Savior when he commanded us to be baptized. I am inclined to think that much of the carelessness which we see manifested on the subject of baptism arises out of the foregoing supposition ; and though it is utterly false, yet, while it is held as a truth—as it is by a large majority of those calling themselves Christian sects—it will exert over them all the force of a truth. So our labor to ascertain the thing contained in the command, “Be baptized,” will be, to a great extent, lost, so far as the class called Christian sects is concerned. Still, I propose to cast my bread upon the waters, with an abiding faith in the providence and mercy of God that it may be gathered up somewhat in the future.

But how shall we learn what the Lord did really mean ? With us, at least, the Bible contains all that we can learn of God's will concerning us. While, then, we studiously include, as the will of God and as the matter and measure of our faith and practice, all that he has said in the Bible, we do with equal interest and earnestness exclude everything not found in the sacred volume. Shall we not learn what the Lord did really mean by learning what he did really say ? We shall need, in this work, only such philological and exegetical rules as are needed for the examination and understanding of other books of like import and antiquity. Much of the best intellect and learning of the last three hundred years has been expended on the baptismal question, and the results, not the most gratifying, are be-

fore us. One party demonstrates, as it supposes, that *baptisma* means immersion. They begin with the rise of Greek learning and trace the word, with its cognates, throughout its history to the death of the language. They exhibit it in its every occurrence and connection as used by poets, rhetoricians, philosophers, critics, historians, geographers; by writers on husbandry, on medicine, on natural history, on grammar, on theology; by writers of romances, epistles, orations, fables, odes, epigrams, sermons, narratives; by writers of various nations and religions, Pagan, Jew, and Christian, belonging to many different countries and through a long succession of ages. In every instance, it is boldly asserted, the word has retained what is everywhere and by every one admitted to have been its primary, ground meaning—immersion. The other parties admit, with not a dissenting voice, I think, that the primary sense of the word is immersion; but claim that it does sometimes mean something else. They say it may mean something else, hence they feel at liberty to practice something else. Such is their logic. Pedobaptists do not appear to be certain what the thing is which we are considering. Nearly all their talk and writing is on the subject, not of baptism, but of its possible and probable modes; whereas the thing which the Lord commanded is kept mainly in the background. What that thing is they do not seem to know. As distinguished from its modes they almost never suggest anything.

I propose now to examine the grounds upon which pedobaptists do positively or probably rely for their conclusions.

I.—The unknown thing, the whole of it, lies in a certain one of three modes, so that if we submit to that one mode we will certainly obtain the thing. Thus, suppose sprinkling to be the one mode, then the man who is sprinkled is baptized. Not that sprinkling is baptism; only, the one who has been sprinkled is baptized. Remembering our hypothesis, that the whole of the meaning is in the one mode, it would follow that only the man who is sprinkled is baptized; but if any part of the meaning were in another mode, then our hypothesis would be false, and the one who is sprinkled is only partly baptized. The other mode must be used to fill up the obligation. But this neither removes nor lessens the difficulty. What is this one mode? Is it known to be sprinkling or pouring? Is it known to be immersion? The pedobaptist will hardly take the affirmative of any one of these questions; certainly not of the last one. For, with our hypothesis, should he take any one of them he excludes the others and unchurches all not baptized his way. This is just the thing he is most careful never to do. If he is not certain that baptism is wholly in a certain one of the three modes, then—though sprinkled, poured, or immersed—he can not know that he is baptized, but must rest on a painful uncertainty. This an honest, conscientious man would not be willing to do.

Obviously, if baptism lies in or is had by compliance with a certain mode of a given three, and it is not known, certainly known, in which one it does lie, then, unless we submit to all the modes, we can not feel certain that we are baptized. The reasoning thus far has proceeded upon the supposition that it is not known exactly what baptism is, only that it lies in or is connected with one certain mode of three given ones. It is not uncommon to hear it said that it is not important to know the mode, so we have the thing. This is certainly true, provided we can have the thing without the mode. But whether the thing and its mode are identical or not, it is not contended, I think, that the former can be enjoyed independently of the latter. Hence, to the full extent of the thing's importance, are we interested in knowing the mode of possession.

II.—But perhaps the more common view is that baptism is couched in, or, as a consequence, follows compliance with, any one of the three modes, sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. This is the faith of Methodists and some others, if I have not misunderstood them. Is it true? No pedobaptist, when doing something which he calls baptism, to which he directs the attention of God, angels, and men, will pretend to cite you a passage of Scripture which even he will say certainly proves that baptism is secured by compliance with the mode he is about to administer, or with any one of the three modes, sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. The remotest allusion to such a thought is made in no single text of the whole Bible. Turn from lid to lid, read each chapter and verse consecutively till all are read; the verse is not found that says, or necessarily implies, or even suggests the thought, that baptism, commanded by Jesus Christ, is a thing to be secured by compliance with any one of three specified modes. It was a reckless thinker, if he was not something worse, who invented the thing. Such a one evidences no great reverence or even respect for the sovereign authority of the King of kings, and Lord of lords. True, it is claimed that one text favors, not requires or demands, sprinkling, that another text favors pouring, and that another text favors immersion. I am not sure that this last statement is true. At present I do not remember that I ever heard a pedobaptist cite a text of the Bible which he said or seemed to think proved or favored immersion. I have known some of them to spend hours in ridiculing it; in talking of muddy frog ponds, of dipping, sousing, sneezing, strangling, indecencies, etc. I have known some of them to spend much time and labor upon individuals, to induce them not to submit to immersion; and yet when they did immerse, as they sometimes do, they would do it calling God to witness that they were trying to obey him. Yet no text seems to stand as authority, sovereign authority, for the practice. The inference is irresistible, that the authority of Jesus Christ holds but slack reign over such men. With them no

text stands for the thing they practice, yet they do it. Mark you, it is not claimed that any one of the texts cited as favoring any one of the modes requires or demands that mode, which is just the thing it should do ere a conscientious man could feel at liberty to practice it. No principle of moral or Christian science is better established than this, that no act of obedience to God can be done in righteousness that he has not commanded or in some way plainly required. And, since the Bible contains all we know or can know of God's commandments or requirements, ere we do any act of obedience to God we must see that that thing is enjoined in the Scriptures. Hence, if we say or allow that no text of the Scriptures which on account of its divine authority compels us to sprinkle, pour, or immerse, then, to administer or submit to any one of them is to do that which is abominable and wicked in the sight of God, and very presumptuous on our part. "The grounds of moral obligation, as derived from a revelation, must therefore be *a command of God.*" (Wayland's *Moral Science*, p. 143, italics his.) But if no one of the modes is commanded in any verse or verses of the Bible, then has God not commanded it, and submission to it is not a duty, and he who practices any such mode teaches and practices the commandments of men. Of course, he is very foolish or very wicked who would presume to do any act in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit unless it were found to be enjoined in God's word. I hold that if no text can be found which commands sprinkling (and so of other modes), then sprinkling is not a mode of baptism; hence, he who is sprinkled is not, therefore, baptized. The work before the pedobaptist is hence plain: he must furnish us from the Bible the command of Him who only has right to command on the subject for his mode, else, of necessity, I am compelled to reject them all.

This he will never do; and I believe he has never seriously attempted to do it. The strength of pedobaptist intellect and the zeal of their hearts are mostly spent in attempts to avoid being immersed themselves, or allowing others to be. If half the means which are wasted in opposing immersion, were employed in searching for the truth and duty, more light, much more, would be elicited. At least so it seems to me.

But suppose I grant that one text of the Bible commands sprinkling, another pouring, and another immersion, which must be true, if they all or any one of them may be practiced; then, first, these commands are all for the same persons; or, second, for different persons or parties.

1. If they are all for the obedience of the same persons, then a man must submit to them all, all being commanded him of God. For though it be admitted that the man is really baptized, when he submits to but one of the modes, still, if he refuses to submit to the

others, being commanded him, and of equal authority with the first, his obedience is no obedience at all ; he is not blessed. This conclusion seems to me inevitable, unless it be true that we may set aside or consider as non-essential some of the commandments of God. But if this be true, why not others ? If others, why not all ? This is the road that many a poor frail traveler has taken, only at last to find himself numbered among those who love not God nor obey the gospel of his Son.

2. If it be pleaded that one of these commands is for one man or party or age, another for another, etc., then, unless I had some one authorized, divinely commissioned, to tell me which mode was intended for me, I could never know that I had been baptized, that I had obeyed God in respect to this institution. This divinely commissioned guide we have not ; so that, if the hypothesis under which we are reasoning be true, our ignorance of the proper mode must continue. If there was a distinction made by the apostles, some persons being required to be sprinkled, others poured, etc., we certainly have no account of it. But even if we had, our perplexities would only be increased thereby. For if the apostles made the distinction in question, there must have been a divine reason for it, but we have it not. And further, the same reason that existed then exists yet in all its force, urging us to make the distinctions as they did, without its being possible for us to know how to do it. Now either the three modes, each distinctly, are commanded or they are not. If not, then to the extent that they are not they should be abandoned at once by all. If they are, the answer is in the foregoing. But if the idea of three modes of baptism is not found in the Scriptures, where is it found ? This question can not be easily answered, but probably it was supposed to have some "connection with the essence of the Christian consciousness, like infant baptism." Irenæus "testifies of the profound Christian idea, out of which infant baptism arose, and which procured for it, at length, universal recognition." (*Neander*. Vol. I., p. 811.)

III.—But I may be met with this reply : The modes are all in the word *baptizo*, and this being the word used in giving the command, the modes are thus and therefore authorized. The fact that references are so often made to the lexicons, classics, and fathers to show that the word *baptizo* means sprinkle, pour, and immerse, is proof that the arguist intends to infer from this circumstance that the three modes are thus authorized, else the references are foolish and weak. Without attempting, at present, to decide whether the three modes are in the word or not, it must be conceded that they either are or they are not. If they are not, all of them, in the word, then for some one or more of the modes there is no divine authority, and its or their use is unwarranted and sinful. But if the three modes are certainly in the word, then it will follow that no one is baptized who has not

been sprinkled, poured, and immersed—all ; for to submit to but one of them is to obey only a part of the command, Be baptized, and this is no obedience at all. I am curious to know why it is thought that the three meanings given the word by pedobaptists, as authority for their three modes of baptism, exhaust it. If they do not, then, though we may comply with any one or even all of the three, we are not certainly baptized. Nay, we are certainly not baptized, there being in the command that with which we have not complied. Let it be granted, for the present, that the lexicons, the classics, and the fathers use the word in the three senses as above, and that for this reason we may rightly sprinkle, pour, or immerse in the name of the Lord. These same authorities as certainly give us dye or color, bathe, drown, moisten, pop, etc., as meanings of the word, as they do sprinkle and pour. How, then, could a pedobaptist object to my taking a proper subject and coloring him to suit my taste, or rather, as the taste of the candidate is generally consulted, to suit his taste? To color is one meaning of the word, so in this case I only adopt one of the modes of baptism as well sustained as sprinkling is. And I observe the same rule in the selection of a mode that they do. First, I take one of the meanings of the word ; and, second, I consult the taste of the candidate or operator or both, and no pedobaptist can object. True, he will probably say that the selected mode is vulgar ; not only because the person, a young lady perhaps, was dipped, but colored. I deny it. Gravely, I have the same authority for coloring that he has for sprinkling, in the name of God, for baptism. Besides, there is a clear advantage in favor of my mode over his. Mine involves, necessarily, compliance with several meanings of the word or modes of baptism. When we dye anything we dip it, as they did anciently, and that is one meaning of the word. We also bathe it, and wet it, and moisten it, and pop it, and souse it, all of which are meanings of the word as truly and certainly as is sprinkling or pouring, with at least a small balance in favor of coloring.

IV.—I believe that some of the pedobaptists hold that there is a difference between the thing baptism and its mode ; so that, though the thing is commanded by the use of the Greek word *baptizo*, the mode of the thing is left optional with us, is not commanded. According to this hypothesis, there is no divine authority for any mode. Hence, according to the injunction of the Apostle Paul, “and whatsoever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus,” we are, by necessary implication, forbidden to use any mode whatever. And since, by common consent, the thing is not secured without a mode, we are hence forbidden to be baptized. The mode not being in the word, but a different thing from it, according to our present hypothesis, we need not look to the word to ascertain what is to be done, so far as mode is concerned, but must look elsewhere. The

word is found everywhere in the lexicons, the classics, the fathers, and in the Old and New Testaments ; but this fact must not be allowed to furnish us any assistance in learning the mode to be used. True, from these sources we should expect to be able to learn the meaning of the word. But it must be remembered that the meaning of the word is only the thing to be done, whereas we are seeking to find, not the thing baptism, but the mode of it, which is, by supposition, quite a different affair. Shall we, then, look to the Bible to learn the mode of baptism to be adopted? I would think not. For by the hypothesis in hand, the mode is not in the only word in all the Bible that tells us anything about baptism. Since, then, we can not learn the mode from the lexicons, classics, fathers, nor from the use of the word baptizo in the Bible, where shall we learn it? The Papist says : We do not pretend to go to the Bible for the mode of baptism ; the decisions of the Church are, with us, of authority equal to the statements or commandments of the Bible. Mother Church says : "Sprinkle the holy water upon them and they shall be clean ;" hence, the mode is sprinkling. But with the Papist I propose no controversy. It would be vain. The Pope sits in the temple of God, and has openly declared himself God. Nay, more ; he exalts himself above every one that is called god, or that is worshiped. So true is this of the papacy, that it openly avows its right to change or annul the times and seasons, the commandments and ordinances of God, all of them. Thus we dispose of the pedopapist. Now, what of the pedoprotestant? Whence his authority for mode? If we may judge from the number of times that the question has been voted upon among them, I should be inclined to think that they regarded church authority as the authority in the case. In two or more of these protestant parties their churches have canonized three modes, and have set them before the applicants for baptism, with the request : Choose ye which you will serve. With them their church, like the papal church, seems to authorize the mode. Indeed, it goes further in this direction than does the papacy. The latter authorizes one certain mode, whereas the former authorizes three, and besides authorizes the candidate to choose, thus dividing the honor of selecting a mode between the church and the sinner.

V.—A pedobaptist translation of the New Testament made faithful to their views of baptism, if they really have any, and made in obedience to a rule requiring the translation of every word, would be a curious literary production, truly. Why should they not attempt such a work? Have they not the men of learning, the means, the cause of the truth at heart, to do it? To say that they have not, would scandalize them ; to say that they have, still leaves the question unanswered : Why do they not do it? Is the word which is used in the Greek original through which the Lord enjoins upon us the duty

of baptism, translated into good, perspicuous English in the book they use? It certainly is not. If this be true, and they still refuse to translate, it must be because they either do not know how to translate the word, or they are unwilling that the people for whom God made the Bible should have it all. But suppose that we have found one who determines that the blessed gospel of the grace of God should be faithfully translated into the language we speak; that such a treasure should not be hid, even in part, from the most vulgar eye that looks, nor from the poorest heart that beats. The question arises in his mind: Translate for all the people? Bring every word, and phrase, and sentence, down to the comprehension of the meanest capacity? Like the murderous Jews around the cross of the dying Lord, he shakes his head and mutters: Our craft, our craft is in danger. But still the people must have, says this good man, the whole truth. He begins his labor with this single and simple rule before him: "The thoughts on the page of the sacred Greek shall all appear distinctly on the English page." Faithfully he labors on each word, robing its thought in a plain, neat English dress. The holy fire kindles, as thought after thought in their pure state pass into his mind and then to the paper. All goes well and gloriously on till, just ahead, behold, like Job's leviathan of the deep, the horrid word *baptizo* rises to his view. At first he is considerably perturbed. Had Tam O'Shanter's visions at Kirk Alloway, "where ghaists and howlets nightly cry," suddenly burst upon his sight, he would have been scarcely more confused. But after a few moments' reflection I will suppose he mused as follows: "No pedobaptist, so far as I can remember, ever yet set himself fairly and earnestly to grapple with this word who was not compelled to yield a decided, though it would seem a reluctant, testimony in favor of immersion. Reluctant, I mean, only in some cases; decided, always. Mosheim, Dr. Wall, Luther, Calvin, Neander, Melancthon, J. Taylor, Olshausen, Barnes, Doddridge, McKnight, Wesley, Conybeare, Bloomfield, Whitby, Grotius, Locke, Tillotson, Clark, Dr. Geo. Campbell, Chalmers, Tyndale, and Carson, all bear testimony, with more or less definiteness, in favor of immersion. This catalogue of great names could easily and truthfully be extended almost indefinitely." But his rule requires him to translate the word. He shrinks not from the task. The passage in hand is Matt. 36. "And—and—and—what shall I say?" Again he soliloquizes: "All the Baptist translators say unhesitatingly, 'were immersed.' All pedobaptists who translate the word at all, say 'were immersed.' And, too, there was John's raiment; it was of camels' hair, and he had a leathern girdle about his loins. Why was this? To say the least, it looks very much like he was an immersionist. And what raises the suspicion still higher is, he baptized in the river of Jordan. Lyman Coleman says, without note or comment, 'John's

baptism was by immersion.' If the Lord had meant sprinkle, I confess I do not see why he did not use the word *rantizo*. That is the Greek word for sprinkle. And I know equally well that *baptizo*, the word which the Lord did use, is the Greek word for immerse. All this perplexes me much, and the more so because I was not immersed, nor were my people. I am very willing that others should immerse, and I will recognize it as valid. If I should immerse any one in the name of God, I should do for him what was never done for me. Besides, a thing can not be done in the name of God that he has not authorized. If immerse is authorized of God, and otherwise it should not be regarded as valid, then there is at least one part of his authority to which I have not submitted. But how shall I translate this sentence? If I say 'were sprinkled, poured, and immersed,' then each of John's disciples was sprinkled, poured, and immersed. Such a translation would be foolish. It can not be true. If I say 'were sprinkled, poured, or immersed,' then John's disciples submitted to but one of the three modes, and my translation does not tell us which it was. It leaves us to guess at it, with two chances out of three against us. If I say 'were sprinkled,' then the learned will hold me in contempt. No one ever so translated the word. And, too, the pourers and immersers will not agree with me as they now do."

Here I will leave my friend to his musings, and ask the conscientious reader to form his own conclusions. I know the subject is a hackneyed one, and I can scarcely hope to invest it with any new interest. The old idea of baptism being a non-essential is now an exploded one. There is some blessing, no matter what it is, connected with and contingent upon being baptized. If the foregoing reflections shall assist any one poor mortal to the real enjoyment of this blessing, I will feel that my humble labor has not been in vain. There is another thing clear to my mind as light, and that is, that no pedobaptist can fully and faithfully translate the New Testament and still hold his faith on this subject. For in any attempt of this kind, the word *baptizo* must be rendered in some way. But in every instance of such attempt it has been translated by the word immerse, or some equivalent word; the translators thus being indeed, or at least becoming, immersionists.

W.

MISSING NUMBERS.—I have heard much complaint during the past year of numbers not reaching subscribers. I have simply to say, I have done my best. More has not been in my power. Whenever a subscriber fails to get a number, let him notify me, and another will be sent him. This is all I can do. For the negligence of Post Masters I can not feel responsible.

EMANATION AND CHARACTER OF HUMAN SPIRITS.

Bro. Lard :—I have read and re-read, with much interest and satisfaction, your long, logical, and very lucid article, published in your *Quarterly*, and since republished for circulation as a tract on *Spiritual Influence as it Relates to Sinners*. And while I agree with you in the main in the great proposition, that, "as far as conversion is traceable to an influence not human, neither providential, it is traceable to the truth and to that alone;" think this is well sustained; and agree in your positions, reasonings, Scripture argument, and illustrations generally; there is one position or principle in it, near the beginning, under the head of "The Necessary," which, though plainly expressed, to my mind is not so clear or so obviously true. It is, that the human spirit, to every individual of Adam's race, emanates immediately from God, and is, consequently, as pure as Adam's was, thus derived, before he sinned. "Adam's sin," you say, "corrupted Adam's nature; his whole nature. This can not be denied." Right. "But Adam's nature was Adam's flesh and Adam's spirit." Right again. I would, however, rather say, to embrace it all—flesh or body, soul and spirit. "To what extent," you ask, "do we inherit it?" And answer: "We inherit his flesh, not his spirit. All, then, that we inherit from him that has been corrupted by sin is our flesh or body. But this much we do inherit from him; and hence to this extent have we been corrupted by his sin. But our spirits we inherit not from Adam. In them, therefore, is no corruption derived from him. Our spirits we inherit immediately from God. They are, consequently, when first received, like their source, pure, absolutely pure." (Vol. I., p. 115.) And to the same effect on "Original Sin." (Vol. III., p. 152.)

Now it may be so, or it may not. Whether true or false, the great proposition, and your other arguments and conclusions, are not at all affected by it. But you assume; you attempt not to prove it. If true, I would like to see it proved and the proofs. As you say, a little further on, of the knowledge of "the ecclesiastic mystics, who seem to be accurately read in the subtleties of depravity," you are "curious to know how they know whether it is depravity merely, or some degree thereof, that creates the necessity;" I am "curious to know" how you know what you here state of the immediate derivation of our spirits, as not from or through our parents, but from God, and of their consequent purity. Whence did you get this knowledge? In what book or books read it? What say the Scriptures?

In their account of the creation of all the living before that of man, the record is: "And God said: Let the earth bring forth grass,

the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth, and it was so." "And God said : Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowls that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." "And God said : Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth, after his kind, and it was so." (Gen. i., 11, 20, 24.) The "seed" of the herb it hence appears was "in itself," placed there by the Creator ; and the same was true of the "seed" of all the living creatures. They were commanded to bring forth, and they did so, "after their kind ;" the grass, from grass-seed ; the herbs, from the seed of herbs ; and "the moving creatures which had life"—the fishes, the fowls, and "cattle, and creeping things"—all, according to and up to all the constituents of their respective individualities. The beasts which had spirits begot them ; and beasts also brought them forth. "Who knoweth the spirit of the beast ?" says Solomon ; or, "Who knows the spirit of man ?" This much he knew, and we know, that "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding ;" that when he dies, it goes upward, returns to God ; and that there is a spirit in the beasts which goes downward to the earth and perishes. But "as one dies, so dies the other ;" yes, they "all have one breath, so that a man has no pre-eminence," in this respect, "above the beast, for all is vanity." (Eccl. iii., 19.) In what respect ? In having a spirit, and in being subject to death. In the quality and character of the spirits, however, there is a difference, and also in their final destiny.

Of the creation of man it is said : "And God said : Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," etc. "So God created man in his own image ; in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them. And God blessed them and said unto them : Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it," etc. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life ; and man became a living soul." (Gen. i., 26, 27 ; ii., 7.)

What this image and likeness of God were we are not informed nor whether or not by the fall he lost or still retains them. It is said here, that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." This we understand to be his body. "And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life." This we understand of his soul and spirit ; and that so he "became a living soul." But it had before been said of every "living creature"—of the "cattle, creeping things, and beasts of the earth"—that they were brought forth of the earth. God formed their bodies, and was the Father of their spirits also. They lived and moved and had their being, alike with man, in God. They were commanded to bring forth, and they did so, after their

kind ; and their offspring resembled themselves ; and, as we have before observed, were identical with themselves in all that constituted their respective individualities. The beasts that had spirits begot them alike with their bodies, and beasts brought them forth. Or we think so—so understand the commandment to “bring forth and to multiply ;” and that so it was obeyed. If so with the beasts, why not so with man ? If the spirit of a beast is derived to it mediately, through a beast, from God, why not the spirit of man, through man ? The children of human beings resemble their parents in mind, disposition, strength, character, and in other respects, as much as the offspring do the parents of lower animals. The Scripture, in saying that God breathed into the nostrils of the first man, Adam, the breath of life, did not say to him, nor does it say to us, that so the soul and spirit of his offspring should be or was communicated to them. Nor in the command, “Be fruitful, and multiply and replenish the earth, and subdue it,” did God say to Adam, Do you now beget the body and I will give it a spirit. Nor is there any intimation afterward, in all the accounts of the begettings, conceptions, and births in the human family, that the children of Adam did not, by generation, as fully and entirely receive their souls and spirits as they did their bodies—flesh, blood, and bones—from him. The Scriptures inform us of only one creation, that at the beginning, the last work of which was man. They inform us of the creation, or emanation immediately from God, of only one human spirit, Adam’s. As Eve, our mother, afterward derived her body from him, we have no testimony—consequently no faith, and, I think, no reason to believe otherwise than that she then derived from him, with it, her spirit also. For want of other testimony, therefore, and till further enlightened, I believe or think that from Adam and Eve, and through them from the good Father of all, comes to all of us our spirits. If so, as Adam’s sin corrupted his whole nature, he transmitted it, so corrupted, to his whole posterity.

“Our flesh or body,” you say “derived from Adam, has been corrupted by sin.” But how and to what extent ? You do not inform us, nor are we by the Scriptures informed. But if we derive our souls and spirits also from Adam, we have some idea of a taint or bias to evil, so derived, which accounts for all sinning and all dying. “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned.” (Rom. v., 12.) No age is exempt from death. Christ our Lord came not to call the righteous, but sinners ; and he died only for sinners. If, therefore, infants are saved by him, that “taint” or “bias” to evil, or whatever it may be that constitutes us sinners and subject to death, is expiated and removed by his blood. This, to me, appears more scriptural and reasonable than that the spirit of any child of Adam is pure—as pure as his was originally, when he received it direct from God.

"If infants are saved by Christ," we say, that is, persons of the human family dying in infancy. We suppose they are all infants, and that "election and reprobation" are not predicable of them ; or, if one is, that it is election, and all are elected. And we understand our Lord in saying, "of such is the kingdom of heaven," to have said, not only all like them, but the infants themselves. And "where sin abounded," extending from Adam to them, causing their death, "favor did much more abound" through Adam the second, in expiating that sin and in giving them life. As were their sin and death, so also the removal of them ; the purification of their spirits, and souls, and bodies, were, are, and ever will be, to all such alike, without the exercise of any agency of their own. Their salvation is of God. All of, from, and directly or immediately by him. How he effects it, in applying the blood of Christ ; by what agency, if any, of the Holy Spirit ; he has not informed us. And it is not important for us to know. However it may be, the gospel is for adults, and only for us as adults. The commission of our Lord to his apostles to make disciples, was given them to act on in preaching to such as could hear, understand, weigh testimony, and believe. In obeying this, he promised to be with them always. How ? He answers elsewhere : By the Comforter, the Spirit of truth. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give him to you," he says. (John xiv., 16, 17.) Again : "When they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (Matt. x., 19, 20.) Here we have some divine teaching of "spiritual influence, as it relates to saints." But "to sinners" is the subject of the article in hand. What is it—its nature ? How is it exerted—sometimes immediately on the mind, or always through means ? These are the questions discussed.

It is taken for granted, and will not probably be disputed by any reader and believer of the Bible, that in conversion the Holy Spirit does exert power on the sinner, and this "power" may be called "spiritual influence." This power, this influence of the Spirit, so far as the Scriptures teach, or we can get any testimony from them, you have very clearly and ably shown, I think, is inherent in, is the sense of, and so is inseparable from, the divine word. If any other influence of the Spirit be necessary for this work, to effect the turning of a sinner from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God ; that we know not what it is, have no testimony, and consequently can have no faith about it.

That man—every adult human being—is depraved, morally corrupt, and a sinner, whatever is or might have been his or her character in infancy, and so needs conversion, renovation, and regeneration, is a fundamental truth, upon which is founded the whole remedial scheme

of redemption by the blood of Christ. But that any are so depraved, corrupt, and so great sinners, that the gospel plainly preached may not be understood, believed, and obeyed by them, by all who hear it, without the putting into it, or adding to it, as an accompaniment, any other influence or power of the Spirit, than the power of its sense; never has been shown and never can be, from any type of man, any law of nature, any oracle of reason, or from any teaching of the Living Oracles of divine revelation. For the truth, yours truly, E.

REPLY.

My dear Brother E.—I wish it were in my power to furnish an answer completely satisfactory to all your difficulties; but, in candor, I must say it is not. Many things, as you well know, we hold to be true; or, if not true, probable, not because they are indisputable, but, because, upon the whole, they seem to possess more of the marks of truth, or perhaps to be attended with fewer difficulties, than the adverse side. For this reason I still hold as true the position to which in the preceding you object, or rather of the truth of which you seem not satisfied. My convictions may have been stated more positively than the reasons assigned seemed to you to warrant; but, then, my object was to state the case strongly, and not to argue it at length. I expected it to elicit comment and objections, which it has done, from more pens than yours; but hoped that after all these I might be able to present in its defense a fuller array of proofs than was at the first offered. But in this I am disappointed. Indeed, I am sorry to say that I have not given the subject the attention I feel sure it merits. For this I have no apology, except that onerous duties have continually crowded it out of my mind.

Immediately after the appearance of the first article in which the subject was mentioned I received a letter from our accomplished and highly thoughtful brother, Proctor, of Missouri, suggesting the same view, as probable, which your piece contains, but not drawing your inferences. To this I then intended a reply, but the question has still glided away from me till the present.

To you I may not be able to make my convictions appear to be well established; but to yours, I believe, an insuperable objection can be stated. True, this does not prove mine to be right; but, then, it leaves them to occupy the field without a rival.

Your argument is one deduced from analogy. You say that the trees and plants are known to propagate, by means of their seeds, themselves, and all that enters into themselves. This I shall not question. You further say that the beasts of the field, the birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea—in a word, all the lower animals, reproduce themselves in the same way; that whatever and all that enters into the young of a kind, and constitutes it, is derived from the

parent. This, also, I shall not deny. But you go further, and conclude that this is also true of man. Now it is just here that your argument breaks down. Certainly you have a right to conclude that whatever one tree derives from its parent, all trees derive, unless something is known to the contrary. You also have the right to conclude that whatever one inferior animal transmits to its offspring, all animals of the same kind transmit; but this you can not conclude of animals of a different kind, unless the fact be known. Now you admit that the lower animals have in them no immortal spirits or minds, such as men have. They hence have none either transmitted in generation or derived in any other way. They have no immortal spirits. But men have. Here, therefore, there is no analogy between man and the lower animals. Hence, you can not reason from the one to the other. Men have immortal spirits. These they derive either from their parents or from God. But the inferior animals have no spirits in this sense. Can we, then, infer from a being that has no spirit, how a being who has one derives it? Surely not. You thus see that analogy can not aid us here, for the simple reason that we have none. Hence the question, Whence comes the human spirit? still remains to be settled, if it can be, in some other way.

By analogy you conclude that man propagates his spirit, by natural generation, just as he does his flesh. From this you infer that since Adam transmitted to his offspring the corruption of his flesh, so must he have transmitted the corruption of his spirit; and that hence we inherit from him both a corrupted body and a corrupted spirit. Were your premises granted, I do not see that your conclusion could be denied. But this is precisely what is not done; and your premises being denied, I see not how you are to establish them. Indeed, I believe you will find the task an impossible one. Of course, you will not attempt to infer the truth of your position from the mere improbability of mine; yet, if mine be not true, sure I feel that yours must be. That the truth lies between them is simply certain, but with which seems the difficult question. Furthermore, the instant the one is proved, the other is disproved; for they are wholly incompatible. Nay, more, to whatever extent the one is shown to be probable, to that extent the other is shown to be improbable. Hence, if on the side of the one even the lowest degree of probability is found, but on the side of the other none, then the truth must be held to be with that side, not with this.

Now you will remember that in the article on original sin the attempt was made, briefly to be sure, to establish the probability, at least, of the position in question. How far that attempt was successful I must leave you to judge. As the subject is again brought forward after the lapse of many months, and as this will, to some extent, go into the hands of new readers, it may be well to repeat, in sub-

stance, as far as this can be done from memory, for I have not the article by me, what was there said. You will then remember that the position was held to be probable, for the following reasons :

1. That it is the general sentiment of mankind that the human spirit is an immediate gift from God, and not inherited through natural generation. In this case, the world has no interest to be wrong ; nor, even were it wrong, would it thereby be seriously injured. Its opinion has hence been formed without undue bias to error. There is, consequently, a presumption that it is right. This presumption on the one side, and nothing on the other, becomes with the prudent man a fair ground of decision. He hence holds with the world.

2. At death the body returns to the dust as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it. This is the decision of inspiration. With which one of the views in hand does it most easily harmonize ? God gives the spirit. Now to say that he does this through natural generation seems forced ; to say that he does it immediately, natural. I hence prefer the latter. As the return is at once from the body to God, so the giving would seem to be at once from him to the body. This, indeed, would make him "the Father of the spirits of all flesh."

3. Of God it is said, "he formeth the spirit of man within him." That this is more easily and naturally construed of an immediate and direct formation than of an indirect one through natural generation, seems hardly to admit of a doubt. Indeed I do not see how it can be very consistently construed otherwise.

4. To the preceding may yet be added the following : The Scriptures certainly do not teach that Adam's sin has corrupted the spirits of his children. It may, then, fairly be denied ; and this denial stands good against it till it is proved. But proved it can never be ; hence it must be denied. But if human spirits be derived from Adam, they are corrupt, and the fact can not be denied. I hence conclude that they are not so derived.

After all, however, it must be admitted that a perfectly satisfactory case has not been made out ; and that the most that can be claimed for it is, that, upon the whole, it seems the most probable view we can form.

With these brief comments, my dear Bro. E., the matter is again submitted to your courtesy and further thought. Most fraternally yours.—Ed.

RELIGION dwelling in the heart, rooted in the feelings and affections, is a living, active, and real existence. It purifies the fountain of moral life and health. It animates, inspires, controls, and gives a new impulse to our active powers. It imbues the soul with a divine life, and plants the incorruptible seeds of a glorious immortality in man.—*Alexander Campbell.*

HOW CAN IT GET IT?

PRACTICALLY the most difficult question the church of the present day is called upon to consider, and we doubt not this has ever been the case, is, How shall it get the money it needs? Let none object to the form in which we express the question. We say, *the money it needs*. This is both plain truth and plain English. The church needs money; and this is her greatest temporal need. Give her money, and she will provide herself with everything else; give her money and everything else, and she will soon bring her sublime mission to an end. Withhold money from her, and you retard her great work; retard her great work, and you indefinitely postpone the day of her deliverance. These propositions, with us, fall only a little below simple intuitions. Heretofore, the *Quarterly* has not said much on practical matters. Difficult theoretic questions have been the questions which it has chiefly discussed. We propose a slight change. Not that we propose to abandon such questions as hitherto have mainly occupied our attention. Not at all. We only propose now and then the consideration of a strictly practical one. In the present number we inaugurate the task.

But let none imagine that we are so vain as to think that by a single article, read only by a few hundred people, we shall produce a revolution in conduct touching the matter in hand. We have no such thought; and yet we hope this humble contribution will not be without its effect. Revolutions of the kind to which we allude, and which we are so anxious to see effected, are not the work of a single hand nor of a single day. Only when many minds are thinking of them, and when many hands are engaged to bring them to pass, will they be effected, and then only after a long time has elapsed. We are especially anxious at present to have the attention of our preachers directed to the question in hand, and their whole hearts and energies enlisted in the work; for through them, after all, the work has to be done; and the sooner they learn the fact the better.

We have said the greatest temporal need of the church is money. Are we justified in this? We profoundly believe we are, and shall now proceed to state the grounds of this belief.

I.—We set it down as a thing indisputable, that the great master-want of the age in which we live is a translation of the Holy Scriptures, Old Testament and New, as perfect as is in present human power to make it. This we say in full view of all that now exists in the form of translations, ancient and modern. Of the Old Testament we shall speak first, and first of its text.

That the text of the Old Testament is in a much better state of preservation than that of the New, no one at all acquainted with the question will deny. Nor is it difficult to account for the fact. To the Jews more than to any others are we indebted for this text. They have had a deep interest to keep it pure, and but few incentives to corrupt it. In it is contained the religion of their fathers; and to the religion of their fathers they have ever been most obstinately devoted. This religion they have always read and studied, and taught to their children, in the identical words in which God delivered it to their fathers,—words which countless millions of times were in the lips of those fathers. Nothing, therefore, can exceed their veneration for these words. That they should consequently preserve them pure is a thing founded in the very nature of the case. Again: the religion of the Jews has been for the most part one. They have not been divided into belligerent parties as have been so-called Christians. Consequently, opposing sects have not been moved by strong temptation to alter the text each to favor its particular tenet. The text has hence escaped this fertile source of corruption. Moreover, the copies of their text have been very numerous; they have been carried into all civilized and many uncivilized countries; hence, where a copy, no matter from what cause, has become defective or corrupt, it has been an easy matter to correct it by comparison with other copies kept pure. The text of the Old Testament may therefore be accepted as pure to a degree highly satisfactory.

How deep is the regret that so much can not be said of the translation of this text we daily read! Indeed, of this translation it is not going too far to say, it is blurred in every page with the most glaring, and hence the most inexcusable errors. These errors we are constantly reading as holy writ, printing as holy writ, and teaching to our children as holy writ; yet they are in fact but blunders, it may be of good-meaning, but still incompetent, hands. What excuse can we offer to God and to our children for still continuing to transmit these errors from generation to generation? Simply none. Now that the necessary talent and necessary learning could be commanded to give us a faithful translation of this invaluable book, no well-informed man will deny. If this country could not afford it, certainly Great Britain could. Why, then, do we not avail ourselves of this talent, and do the work? The answer is deeply discreditable. *We will not furnish the necessary money.* Let none say *we can not.* This would be more discreditable still.

As indicative more specifically of our wants in regard to the Old Testament, take the single book of Daniel. Of all the prophetic books of the Old Testament, this is beyond question the most important. If not the most important in every sense, and to all ages since it was written, certainly it is the most important to us of the present age.

It sketches, in dates, and symbols, and historic facts, the founding and destiny of the glorious kingdom to which we this day claim to belong. In all that in any way affects or pertains to this kingdom we feel the most absorbing interest. Especially is this interest felt in such facts and signs as seem to point to its end. Many believe that end to be near; that is, they believe the day to be not remote when the kingdom in its present form will cease, and become the everlasting kingdom of our God. Whether this belief be well or ill founded is a matter about which we are not now specially concerned. In this chiefly lies our present concern—to learn whatever and all that can be learned respecting this kingdom, whether it end soon or not. On this point no book could aid us so much as a faithful translation of the great chronological prophecy of Daniel. Yet of all the books of the Old Testament, our present version of Daniel stands perhaps the lowest. Hence the very book which we most need, and which would be of most benefit to us, is the book in which we can least confide. A severely accurate translation of Daniel, made from a severely amended text, would be (the New Testament aside) the best gift heaven could now bestow on the world. Yet we have not that translation, nor even a prospect of it,—and this solely for the want of the necessary funds. We blush while we so write. Yet a less sum than a Roman Catholic synagogue now going up in the city of Lexington will probably cost when completed, would give us, not only the translation we need of Daniel, but of the whole of the Old Testament. Indeed, one hundred Christian men could be found in the single State of Kentucky who could contribute the sum thus needed, and not feel it as much as most preachers would feel the fare from where I now sit to where I live,—a distance of little more than thirty miles. Should this be so? Surely few will be bold enough to affirm it.

But we shall be told that the Bible Union is now engaged in giving us the very work we need. Perhaps so. But we are not in a mood to wait twenty years, perhaps twice that long, on the Bible Union, while it is glorifying itself, and telling us what it *is going* to do, and then in the end be presented with an abortion such as has recently fallen from its press. We want a *translation* of the Old Testament expressed in simple, lovely, modern English, and not a feeble revision which, when completed, shall hardly excite the criticism, much less the confidence and respect, of a dozen scholars either in Europe or America. We expect nothing from the Bible Union.

With the New Testament the case stands somewhat different. Here the translations are far better, the text far worse. Indeed, the most serious objection that can be urged to a few of our modern translations, is, not that they are inferior translations, but that they are translations in many places, not of *the* true, but of a *false* text. Heretofore this has been, in part, at least, unavoidable; but now it is

quite otherwise. At present we are certainly in possession of very ample means to correct, if not to perfect, the text of the New Testament. There is hence not a solitary reason why the work of translation should not at once begin. True, we still lack, in part, the aid which we might derive from a fac-simile of the Vatican MS., but when shall we not lack this aid. It may be never. It is idle, therefore, to withhold from the world what we are now so amply able to give it, because possibly by waiting we might give it something more or something better. To the text, as now corrected by Tischendorf, Alford, Tregelles, Green, and others, we may expect little more to be added. At once, therefore, should the world have the benefit of a faithful translation of this text. With our present helps, three years would be enough to complete it; three competent men would be enough to do the work, and we are bold to say we believe they can be found; and thirty thousand dollars would cover the expense, except the printing. The single county of Fayette, State of Kentucky, can furnish thirty brethren who could give the money and feel no inconvenience from their act. Memorable would be the day in which they should inaugurate the noble work.

Here, now, is a great and important work which the church should accomplish through her members. But this work she can never accomplish without money; and the lack of money is the sole hindering cause. From these premises, therefore, how true it appears that the need of money is the church's great temporal need!

II.—As the second most serious want of the church, I name the want of preachers. That a correct translation of the New Testament, from a pure text, would achieve much, we well know; but this instrument, so mighty for good when skillfully and faithfully wielded, is yet comparatively inefficient, except when in the hands of men who can adequately present its contents to the world, and successfully defend them when presented. Indeed, next to a correct expression of God's will, no want rises so high in the church, nor is any felt so keenly as is the want of preachers. To-day fifty thousand of the first class could find, each man, more than he could do within the limits of these United States. Yet, instead of fifty thousand, the church of God has not now in the whole world even two thousand that are true to the cause of Christ as left by him and the apostles. This is absolutely startling. If in her power to supply these preachers in any considerable measure, how tremendous becomes the responsibility of the church! Of course, we do not say of her in her present feeble state, for she is just emerging from a long dark night, dark as the night of death itself, that she has the ability to supply them all at once; but God will surely require of her that she shall supply them fully up to the limit of her power. Now, the sole thing necessary to supply these preachers is

money. Money will do it, nothing else will. Give me this, I will supply the rest. But we must amplify, and show cause.

With sufficient means, we should have three great sources from which to draw our supply of preachers.

1. The wealthy, and hence the educated young men of the country. Of these, though a few enter the church, none ever think of preaching. From this they are positively deterred by the certain prospect of being subjected to life-long want. Not one preacher in a thousand receives a salary equal to his actual and real wants. He wanders through life homeless and destitute. A single horse, a rented house, one cow, with not money enough in one case in ten to educate his children as they deserve to be, constitute at once his fortune and his reward in this life. All this is well and universally known. That young men who have been reared in affluence should shrink from a life like this is no matter of surprise to me. However strong their love of truth, and ardent their wish to see it propagated, still it is impossible for them to persuade themselves that it is their duty to enter on a life on which such conditions as these are imposed. Nor do we see on what just ground this conclusion can be condemned. Make the preacher's salary equal to that which the lawyer and the doctor can realize, and hundreds who now become lawyers and doctors would joyfully become preachers. And why should it not be so? No living man can answer the question. On the contrary, when we remember the large amount of the finest and most accomplished talent the land can boast, which could in this way be commanded for the benefit of the church, we are prepared stoutly to argue that it should be so. Certainly no life on this earth is so fascinating as that of the preacher, if it were only unembarrassed by the perpetual want which attends it. Why, then, should it not at once be relieved from this want, and the church be thus enabled to avail itself of a means of usefulness now lying wholly beyond its reach? From my soul I wish the inducements were such that every wealthy, educated young man in our ranks, who possesses the proper qualifications, could feel it his duty at once to become a preacher. The results to the church would be most beneficial in countless ways, which I can not here stop to enumerate.

But we shall be told that, were the church in a condition to offer large salaries to preachers, her pulpits would soon be filled with a class of unprincipled mercenaries, who would in the end do her infinite harm and no good. This, however, is simply the rhetoric of fear, and not the utterance of a known fact. If the prospect of a comfortable home, an adequate salary, and a life of sufficient leisure for necessary literary pursuits, be incentives to a knave, certainly they are not less so to an honorable man; and since the members of the church, let us believe, generally belong to the latter class, the chances therefore, that these, and not knaves, would fill the church's pulpits,

are seen greatly to preponderate. We are not in the least affected with the fear implied in the foregoing proposition. The young men of whom we are now speaking, with hardly a single exception, resort to the professions of law and medicine to supply them with the means of future living. Here they generally succeed! Soon they accumulate enough to free life from perpetual anxiety, to make the heart thankful and glad, and the countenance bright. Does success here either spoil them or convert them into knaves? Certainly not. On what ground, then, can we conclude that a like accumulation would have a different effect were they preachers? If a man with three thousand a year, as a lawyer, does not necessarily become a scoundrel, I see not how it is to be made to appear that the same man, with three thousand a year, as a preacher, might not remain an honest man. That a bad man would now and then, by a large salary, be tempted into the church to make merchandise of her, I think highly probable. But because a rule, which would work well for good men, is liable to be abused by bad ones, is it therefore to be wholly disused? We think not. Rather let us act on the rule from a high sense of justice, for the sake of the worthy whom it would so much benefit; and at the same time guard it as far as possible from the abuse of the bad. This would complement our whole duty, and leave but little to fear in the form of danger. I hold it to be a calamity that the church is not in a condition, through her utter want of means, to hold out such inducements to the young men of whom I write as would induce them to become ministers in her holy things. Their talents, their superior education, and especially their social position, would give them access to a class of persons whom, as the case now stands, we can seldom reach with the truth. Whether the case as it stands be right or not, we make no inquiry. The object of the gospel is to save the whole human family; and he is a wise worker who through allowable means seeks to reach them all with this instrument.

But still we fear that large salaries would fill our pulpits with unprincipled men! Do large fortunes fill our pews with unprincipled men? At least those who have them are generally the men whom, whether right or wrong, we evince the greatest solicitude to convert. Or, is it so that a Christian man can be rich and honest at the same time only on condition that he occupy the pew? Is he necessarily a villain if rich and a preacher? No. This plea of a large salary spoiling preachers, or tempting dishonest men to become preachers, is simply a shallow trick of the covetous of the church. They are unwilling to give what God and their conscience tell them they ought to give. The preceding is their reason. It may comfort them in this life, it may damn them in the next. Let them beware.

2. But, with the requisite means, the great unfailing source from which we should obtain our largest complement of preachers is the

poor young men of the church, who are without the means to obtain a suitable education. These possess many advantages over all other classes. A hard, but an honorable life has given them the best of physical constitutions; while virtuous and for the most part Christian parents have endowed them with a moral nature, more than everything else, fitting them to be the ornament and the strength of the church. Could we suitably develop their robust native intellects, suitably train them otherwise, and then for the use of the church avail ourselves of their power for good, human ingenuity is incapable of computing the result. By their social position in life, belonging, as we may say, to the vast, reliable middle class of society, they have almost completely escaped the dangers and evils incident to the two extremes. They have not been enervated by luxury and dissipation, the usual attendants of wealth; neither have their hearts been corrupted and their souls debased by the vulgarity, trickery, and meanness of the lowest rank. They live, and move, and act on the great plane which cuts humanity in two in the middle, dividing the upper section from the lower. This constitutes them the uniting link between the two. They hence touch, not only all the individuals of their own class, but countless numbers of the other two. This puts them in sympathy with the largest proportion of human beings with which it is possible to connect any one class of the human family. Educate them now thoroughly both in literature and Christianity; and with these connections and these sympathies, it is next thing to impossible that they should not gain the mastery over those in whose midst they thus live, and of whom, indeed, they constitute a large component element. A single glance of the mind is enough to enable any one to see the power for good which in a great measure here lies undeveloped. Now, had the church complete control of this power, rendered as efficient as it is indisputably capable of being rendered, her success in the great work of redemption would, in the eye of the world, fall nothing below a miracle of the most stupendous sort. But one thing only is necessary to give her this control. Give her money, and the work is done. But we must descend to specifications.

Suppose the church of Christ in the United States controlled a single institution of learning of sufficient size and sufficiently endowed to enable it each year to clothe, feed, and educate gratis one thousand pious young men. Of these it is not extravagant to say that, after the fifth year, one hundred could be graduated and sent out annually. Let us now compute the probable result of twenty years' operation of this institution. By the end of this period we shall allow that all the first hundred graduates would be dead, though it is simply certain that this would not be the case. Through the whole of the first year, therefore, we assume that we should have one hundred in the field; through the whole of the second, ninety-five, and so on to the end.

Now taking the twenty best years of an educated preacher's life, and how many converts will each year average? Fifty I should think not an over-estimate. The first year of the twenty, therefore, would yield five thousand converts; the second, four thousand seven hundred and fifty; the third, four thousand five hundred; the fourth, four thousand two hundred and fifty, and so on to the end, the decrease being at the rate of two hundred and fifty a year. Hence the whole twenty years would yield an aggregate of fifty-two thousand five hundred. But this is the aggregate for only one hundred graduates. We must next see what the second hundred would yield. These, of course, work only nineteen of the twenty years. Accordingly, the result would be fifty-two thousand two hundred and fifty. The third hundred would yield, in eighteen years, fifty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty. The fourth hundred, in seventeen years, fifty-one thousand. While the whole twenty hundred would, in twenty years, give the enormous result of seven hundred and seventeen thousand five hundred. And all this could be accomplished in only twenty years! Of course, the same results would follow the working of two institutions, each educating five hundred young men; and we should prefer the two to the one, as being hardly more expensive and far more wieldy. Now, when we reflect on these results, it is difficult to persuade ourselves that there is no error in our calculations, and that they could actually be realized. Yet we feel thoroughly satisfied that our estimates fall below, rather than rise above, what, would be the facts in the case. Why, then, should we not have such an institution? There is not one heart in our ranks that would not rejoice over it, and but few hands that would not contribute to it. And were we to go to work as we should, and as we could, ten years would build it. Moreover, we venture the assertion, that our brethren in the three States of Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois, to name no more, could, in that time do the work, and not oppress even one man.

In these States we shall assume that we have two hundred thousand brethren, distributed as follows: Indiana, eighty thousand; Illinois, sixty thousand; Kentucky, sixty thousand. Now allow that one-fourth of these, or fifty thousand of the whole number, could be induced to give each fifteen dollars a year for ten years. This would amount to seven million five hundred thousand dollars (\$7,500,000.) Seven millions of this sum, at six per cent. interest, would yield annually four hundred and twenty thousand dollars (\$420,000.) Each student, let us suppose, would cost annually, to clothe, feed, and educate him, four hundred dollars. Of course, then, a thousand would cost four hundred thousand dollars. Thus it appears that the interest on even seven millions of dollars would not only support the thousand students, but would actually exceed it by twenty thousand dollars. This excess could go to support professors. But still we have left of

the whole sum above named, five hundred thousand dollars. This would be amply sufficient to buy grounds and erect buildings. So that, were we to go to work, as we certainly should, in only these three States, it is thus seen that in ten years we could put this stupendous enterprise in operation. Alas ! how deep is my grief to think that it will not be done !

But we shall be told that one-fourth of two hundred thousand brethren, promiscuously taken, could not be induced to give each fifteen dollars a year for ten years ; and that hence the preceding calculation is not reliable. Strictly viewed, no doubt, this is correct. But while every fourth member might not be expected to give this sum, how many hundreds are there who, for the object named, would most cheerfully give ten, and even twenty times that sum. Hence, while we might not be enabled to raise the whole sum required in the precise way named, still might we raise it in one not less sure to yield it. Thus is shown what we are capable of, if we would only go to work in the right way. When we contemplate these results, it is difficult to see how we can longer delay setting to work to bring them to pass.

3. The third source from which we might successfully draw a supply of preachers is the orphan boys of the land. No other class has larger claims on our sympathies than this ; and in proportion to its numbers, none would more largely repay the kindness we might see fit to bestow upon it. It is matter for real grief that we have not at this moment a school for these unfortunate boys, in which we could constantly keep not less than two hundred. With this number all the time in school, we could easily graduate twenty a year ; and twenty hardy young men sent out each year into the vineyard of the Lord, accomplished for their great work, would not be long in making themselves felt as a power in the earth. Whether we should build for them a separate school, and educate them by themselves, is with me a matter of grave doubt. I should much prefer placing them in college with other young men of the country, from whom they should be in no sense distinguishable. Grouping large numbers of any unfortunate class of the human family together can have no other, it seems to me, than a bad effect on their minds. Particularly is this the case with the sensitive orphan. By this means he is made to feel that in fact he does not belong to the great family of man. Accordingly, concluding that he has nothing in common with it, he does not learn to sympathize with it, and hence is little inclined to work for it. No impression can be more injurious to a preacher than this. He should feel that his life is bound up in a bundle with that of all the world. He should hence love the world with a broad, deep love, and long with his whole heart to work for it. Only then will his work be a pleasure to himself, profitable to others, and acceptable to God.

Besides, were we now engaged in an effort to appropriate these young men to the cause of Christ, we should at the same time be rescuing them from a danger which at present more than ever before threatens them in this country. I allude to the danger of their falling into the hands of the Roman Catholics. At no time in the history of these enemies of mankind have they evinced the determination which they now evince to gain possession of this country. Beyond all doubt they are working for it with the most indomitable will. I wish I felt that they are working without a prospect. That they have decided on an effort to gain control of the African mind of the United States hardly admits of a doubt; and while their success is not, in my judgment, to be regarded as a foregone conclusion, still the decision is clearly indicative of a fact—their settled purpose to get control of every mind in the land which can be reached by them. Are they, then, likely to overlook so obvious a source of power as at present lies dormant in the indigent orphan boys of the country? He knows not the cunning of Jesuitism who so thinks. Mark well this, thoughtful reader, if you live not many years you will see efforts made, that will astound you, to place these boys in Roman Catholic schools. Once there, and the work is done. The South is now groaning in want and broken in spirit; and in the South orphan boys are counted by tens of thousands. Roman Catholics made no mean impression on the Southern mind during the war. Hence no other field on the continent is so inviting to them as this. They are not the people to decline the invitation. Protestants, as such, will make no great effort to educate the orphans of the South; Roman Catholics are certain not to neglect it. Now, could the church of Christ to-day command the means to educate and Christianize these boys, through these boys the church of Christ would in the end Christianize the South. I would risk this plan to effect that object before all others human ingenuity can suggest. Will Christians never enlarge their view of the grand field of labor which lies so invitingly, and stretches so far, all around them? Will they never look beyond the narrow limits of their own neighborhood? Will they never learn to work on a larger scale for Christ, and in a more efficient way to redeem humanity? Is there no way of effecting the needed expansion of thought, and, if possible, the still more needed liberality? Shall our churches forever continue to rotate in the profitless circle of preaching once a month, and the criminal contribution of two hundred and fifty dollars a year? If so, not fifty years will elapse before our light will have expired; and like the cold smoking wick of the candle, we will stand a monument of the certainty with which God visits them who will not work, when they could work, while it is called to-day.

But there yet remains to be noticed another source of vast usefulness to the church, a source not yet named, notwithstanding, in point

of productiveness, it is to be ranked very little below that of the ministry—we mean common school teachers. That we have not heretofore been taking sufficiently into the account the power of these men for good is a proposition painfully certain. The good they do is good done generally in a very modest, unostentatious way; hence very naturally it escapes the notice of all but a few. Still there is no one who has noticed the influence they gain over the mind and even heart of the youth of the land, who has not at the same time felt convinced of the extent to which they could imbue these hearts and minds with the spirit and doctrine of Christ, were they of the type to do so. More than this. I can now call to mind actual instances of school teachers whose work will in the end, I hesitate not to say, far outweigh that of many of the same number of preachers who have occupied no inconsiderable space in the public eye. True, these teachers have not preached, but then they have created and strengthened the purpose to preach in five young men where the preacher has done it in one. Hence in the end, when each is to be rewarded, not only for what he does in person, but also for what he has done through the instruments he has accomplished and set to work, not small will be the reward of these teachers.

Heretofore two sections of our broad country have been almost inaccessible to the gospel,—the extreme South and the extreme North. And although we have not preached much in either, still the little we have preached serves all the purposes of a premise and warrants the conclusion just expressed. The Middle States and the great West and Northwest seem to be the only soil in which Christianity can take ready and deep root. The North and the South, though differing widely in other respects, yet agree in this, that in neither can the primitive gospel be successfully planted. Should they therefore be abandoned? Far from it. Could we send annually hundreds of young men into both sections, deeply imbued with the knowledge and spirit of the gospel, and thoroughly fitted for the common school-room, in twenty years the gospel could be made to sweep over these countries as triumphantly as it has over the prairies of the West. And never, we feel well satisfied, can the truth be made to penetrate these regions so successfully in any other way. Their grown minds are impervious. Respecting them we have no hope. The youth alone can be reached by the gospel, nor can even these be reached except through the common school teacher. When the susceptible mind of the young is expanding under the light and force of literature, under the skillful training of a competent teacher, then is it easy for that teacher to plant in that mind the word of Christ. As the mind solidifies that word will be held fast, and this will both constitute the basis for future religious action, and determine it. Place one thousand men of the kind I am now speaking of in the common schools of

the New England States, and in twenty years they will revolutionize the religion of the country. Never, I fear, will it be done otherwise.

Now, had we a magnificent normal school in which to qualify these young men, and from which to send them out, at once the work might commence. And were we to go to work with energy and with anything like unanimity, in five years we might have such an institution in full operation. Endless and mighty would be the results. Is there no chance to inaugurate the work? At least, can we not begin to talk about it and devise plans; and might not this possibly be followed by action? Let us not be hopeless.

From all the premises now before us, and they might be still further multiplied, it must be apparent that, in a temporal point of view strictly, the church's great need is money. Of course, we do not mean to say that the church can not exist without it, nor that without it Christianity must either become extinct or corrupt. We mean to assert no such thing. Neither do we mean to deny that great good can be accomplished, if not wholly without it, with very small sums of it. This we well know has been done, and we have joy in the belief that it will continue to be done. But we look far away over our widely extended country; and both near us and remote from us we see vast tracts in which the primitive gospel is wholly unknown. We are naturally led to ask: Is there no means of erecting the standard of the cross in these countries? We are assured by the answer there is. But these means can not be provided without large sums of money. Hence our assertion of the church's great need of it. Again: even in the regions where the gospel has been accepted we see it spreading on a comparatively small scale. We simply know it might be made to spread more rapidly. But in order to this, an immense increase is called for in the number both of our preachers and teachers. This increase can not be effected without large and well-endowed schools. To provide these money is needed. Nothing is more obviously true.

But how shall we raise this money? At present, we can not raise it at all; that is, all of it. Still we can raise some; and certain I am, that, with the effort which I am not without hope the church will make, we can raise far more than we are now raising, and consequently do far more than we are now doing.

Before any plan can be devised for raising money, we must understand well the source or sources from which it is to be drawn. Nor is this task difficult. Our country is pre-eminently an agricultural country. The great wealth of the nation is derived from the soil. From this source, therefore, must come the money the church needs. From commerce, manufactures, and the mechanical arts, we may expect but little. Still, from every source from which even a little can be drawn must it be drawn. But what is the plan which promises the largest yield?

Before we offer any suggestions on this question, some important preliminaries require to be stated. Let it, then, be borne in mind that our object should be to raise the largest possible sum which all our resources can yield. But the spirit of Christianity is the spirit of kindness, considerateness, and freedom from oppression. Hence, in raising this sum, we must be most careful not to violate this spirit. Our great rule, therefore, should be to raise the largest possible sum with least possible inconvenience to those who pay it. We should not oppress, for this is not allowable. Neither should we, by the heavy drafts of the present year, cripple our resources for the next; for the demands of each succeeding year will only be heavier than those of the preceding. Hence, we should carefully husband our resources. Our capital stock we must not touch; only the proceeds must we use. By this course we shall be enabled to realize a constant supply, and not simply a supply for the present year, and nothing for the next. With these principles before us, we are prepared for the question of the plan.

The plan of most persons, I doubt not, would be that of retrenchment. Certainly much might be done in this way; but it will not be done. Of all conceivable plans, we have the least confidence in this. That we spend thousands every year on dress and other things, for which not the semblance of real necessity exists, we well know; but there is no reasonable probability that we will ever spend less, unless the time should come when we have less to spend. Just as far, however, as retrenchment can be effected, by all means let it be done. No one can be injured by it, many might be benefited. Certainly preachers should not neglect to urge it on the churches. There will always be found a few true hearts to respond. This will be so much clear gain. I name only a single item in which the principle might be most advantageously applied. There is jewelry enough worn by the Christians in Kentucky to purchase every preacher in it a comfortable home. To those who wear it, this jewelry is of no earthly use; to the preachers, the home would be a life-long blessing. How deep the sorrow that the change could not be made!

We feel thoroughly satisfied that no plan will ever be digested which will succeed, unless we can induce all our brethren to make raising money for the church a specialty. Then the work will be done, not before. As long as Christians neglect to make the wants of the church an object of special thought we shall never do anything in comparison with what we might do. We must make it our business to provide as strictly and as specially for the wants of the church as we do for the education of our children. Then our success will be complete. To indicate more particularly what we mean, and at the same time to show how this plan would work, we propose to render our remarks specific. We shall embody what we mean in the details

of an assumed, but perfectly practicable case. For this purpose I shall select the congregation in Cynthiana, for which I am now holding a meeting. This church numbers, I am told, about one hundred and seventy-five members. These I shall distribute, for want of exact statistics, as follows : farmers, thirty ; their wives, thirty ; mechanics, grocers, and traders, twelve ; their wives, twelve ; professional men and merchants, thirteen ; their wives, thirteen ; young ladies, forty ; young men, twenty-five ; total, one hundred and seventy. Of course, this distribution is not submitted as correct, but merely as proximately so. Now set all these Christians to work for the church of Christ, within certain special and reasonable limits, and what would be the resulting aggregate ? And let us be careful to require of none what strikes the mind as unjust or excessive. Let our demands fall within the limits of humanity and Christian kindness.

I shall suppose each farmer able to turn out on the first day of January, 1867, four pigs each one week old, and one calf of the present year, to be devoted to the church. These he is to feed one year ; and at the end of that time to sell them and place the proceeds at the disposal of the church. At the end of the year the four hogs would weigh each two hundred and fifty pounds, the four one thousand. This, at five dollars per hundred, would be fifty dollars. The calf would be worth fifteen dollars. Thus each farmer would give sixty-five dollars ; the thirty, one thousand nine hundred and fifty.

Each farmer's wife shall appropriate all the butter she can make from one cow, and all the chickens she can raise from one hen. From her cow she will make two pounds of butter a week, and this for forty weeks. The butter is worth twenty cents a pound. Hence her cow yields sixteen dollars. Her hen yields two broods a year of twelve each. These are worth two dollars a dozen, four dollars. Each farmer's wife therefore produces twenty dollars ; the thirty, six hundred dollars.

Each young brother raises one pig. This is worth at the end of the year fifteen dollars. Hence the twenty-five produce three hundred and seventy-five dollars.

Each young sister produces twelve pairs of socks, worth six dollars. The forty, therefore, would pay in two hundred and forty dollars.

The twelve mechanics, grocers, etc., give each one week's profits. This is twenty dollars. Hence the twelve give two hundred and forty dollars. Their wives give each five dollars ; the twelve, sixty dollars.

The thirteen merchants and professional men give each one week's profits, say forty dollars. Hence the thirteen give five hundred and twenty dollars. Their wives, ten dollars each, one hundred and thirty dollars.

Grand total for the church in Cynthiana, three thousand eight hundred and seventy-five dollars. Now we solemnly believe this calculation not excessive to the amount of one dollar ; and, if not, then it measures the duty of the church in the matter in hand. Furthermore, were these brethren to go to work on the plan here suggested, they would raise the sum named easier than they now raise one thousand dollars.

But this calculation does not end here. We have in Kentucky, say sixty thousand members. These would give, allowing two hundred members to each, three hundred churches. Let each of these be supposed able to give one half what the church in Cynthiana gives ; and this we presume not extravagant. Each church would hence give, in round numbers, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-seven dollars, while the whole three hundred would give five hundred and eighty-one thousand one hundred dollars. This sum is enormous in comparison with what we are now doing, and would yield results, were it actually expended, still more astounding than our figures. Whenever every member of the church, from the richest to the poorest, from the brother with princely fortune to the humble servant-girl who earns her bread by washing, deliberately, at the opening of each year, sets down in mind some worthy sum to be raised for the Lord, then will the result exceed even the preceding calculations. And until each member makes the interest of the church his interest, and is brought to feel himself individually bound to set apart each year a portion of his yearly earnings for the cause of Christ, nothing will be done in comparison with what might be. Now, if every preacher in the land will only turn his attention to the subject herein spoken of, and make it his business to enlighten his brethren on it, and point out to them how the work can certainly be done, every year will reveal improvements on the preceding year. In speaking on it, he should be careful not to speak in a chiding tone, nor evince a fault-finding spirit. Let him nobly forget the faulty, and it may be even the guilty past, and in hope work for the future. Let him inspire his congregations with a profound love of Christ and a martyr's devotion to his cause, and when the spirit is glowing with these fine sentiments, then press home the subject in hand. Every such effort will leave its mark for good. Soon our churches will begin to advance, and once fairly in motion, what can they not achieve ?

With the preceding hints and suggestions, we leave the subject with the reader. It is by no means exhausted, but its further discussion is reserved for the future.

Let the society thou frequentest be like a company of bees gathered together to make honey ; and not of wasps, which do nothing but hum, devour, and sting.

SCRIPTURE TYPES—No. 3.

(From the Christian Teacher.)

IN carrying out the plan marked out for ourself in these essays we come now to speak of typical persons. This naturally constitutes the first great chapter of types, and there is not, to a reflecting mind, in all the Old Testament Scriptures, a subject of more interest and beauty ; nor is there one, when rightly understood, that throws more light on the Christian system.

There is nearly a score of persons, in our view of the case, who, in the Old Testament, sustain a typical character ; of course, we can not, in the limits assigned to these papers, speak of all these, or say what we could wish on any of the cases we bring forward. To do this would be to write a book on typology, than which nothing is farther from our design. If we can but suggest trains of thought, and by a few striking examples show how the investigation should be carried on, is all we have promised ourself, or that may be of use to the reader.

The first great type in this chapter that offers himself to our notice is the father of the race, Adam. No one can read the fifth chapter of Romans, from the twelfth verse to the end, and compare what is there said with 1 Corinthians xv., 45-49,—and we ask the reader to do this before he proceeds another step,—and not be convinced that the Holy Spirit intended to instruct us, in a large degree, by means of typical persons. But we find such a fine chapter on “Adam and Christ—a Type,” in Bro. Scott’s able work, *The Great Demonstration*, that we have concluded to adopt it as better than anything we can say. We are moved to do this from the fact that the book is in the hands of but few on this coast, and this may serve to introduce it. He says :

“There is a general analogy pervading all God’s systems, mineral, vegetable, animal, rational, and religious, and the typology of Scripture is founded on that analogy. To eliminate the element of resemblance in Adam, which in a peculiar manner assimilated him to the Messiah, and which was designed to throw into bolder relief the kindred characteristic in Christ, let us look at him unfallen. In Eden, Adam held three headships,—the generic, regal, and the paternal. He was the man, the king, and the husband.

“1. As the generic man he was the fountain-head of humanity,—the great personage from whom the whole race was detailed or particularized. ‘Multiply,’ etc., said the Creator. (Gen. i.)

“2. His natural offspring, however, were not, like a race of mere

animals, created to roam the earth wild and unorganized, but, as gregarious lovers of their kind, were to be wrought up socially and politically into states and kingdoms under him as their imperial head. Hence said the Creator : 'Have dominion,' etc. (Gen. i.)

"3. Again : kingdoms are subdivided into families, that he might comfort each individual as well as the whole. Adam was also the paternal head, the husband and father. 'He brought her to Adam.' (Gen. ii.)

"In the fall, original man, by a power *ab extra*, lost the right to life and all its headships. Free to stand and free to fall, by an act of disobedience he forfeited the life, righteousness, and Paradisaical state of the race, and was accordingly separated from the heavenly communion. The Adamic system ceased to be automatic. Its centre no longer had life in itself.

"It was a solemn epoch. On that day the Creator adjudicated man to death, and might on the same day have slain him and created myriads of other men, all separate from each other and without a generic head. He might, from that crisis, have operated in the production of rational creatures by a succession of individual acts, and created each man as he did Adam, from 'the dust of the earth,' but in this loose and uncompacted form they could neither have been framed into one body, nor, as such, co-operated nor sympathized with each other. Their nature, acts, personality, and state would have been fixed and intransitive, terminating in themselves.

"The Creator met the emergency in great mercy. A new economy, not of law, but of grace, was decreed, by which the race were to be regenerated and associated effort conserved.

"Though man had lost all right to Paradise, to headship, and even life itself, yet he had not, when respited, lost all his powers. He was, therefore, in the generic phase of his nature, constituted a type of the future Deliverer of our race—the Messiah. He could still be a shadow of 'him that was to come.' He could be the generic head, the dynamic unit of a mortal race, and, as such, a 'figure' of Christ, the head of an immortal race.

"It was in his generative phase, then, that Adam was a type of the Messiah. In detailing the species, his personality, acts, and state were, of course, transitive, as is his sin ; death and so forth were to pass over to his offspring, or reappear in his natural posterity. In the fall the glory had departed ; sin usurped the place of righteousness ; death, of life ; and the sorrows of earth, the pleasures of Eden. By the laws of genus and species, therefore, the race were accounted :

"1. Sinners.

"2. Adjudication to death.

"4. Bereft of the Paradisaical state.

"Hence, since the fatal era of the fall of man these sore evils have

haunted our common humanity ; sooner or later they are verified in the experience of every man. Every man, sooner or later, realizes the truth of the apostolic record : ' By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin. So death passed upon all men for that all have sinned.'

" Notwithstanding the many points of dissimilarity between Adam and Christ, which I shall by and by enumerate, there exists between them, nevertheless, an element of resemblance, by which they are with propriety placed in the relation of type and antitype, or the dynamic centres, the generative and regenerative heads of the church and society respectively. Christ is styled the 'second man,' 'the second Adam,' 'the head of the body,—the Church,' 'the Father of the eternal age.'

"As the antitype of the first Adam, the regenerative head of the redeemed, Christ's acts and state, his righteousness, life, and personality are transitive ; that is, they pass over from him to his regenerated children, or, by the law of genus and species, they are repeated in his spiritual offspring, who, by virtue of their relation to him as children, begotten in his own likeness, by the gospel, inherit the following blessings, namely :

" 1. Justification by his blood.

" 2. The Holy Spirit.

" 3. His personality and eternal life.

"If these are subtle relations, and difficult of conception withal,—if their transitive nature appears to any one a capital romance, to comprehend which nature has not imparted to us the necessary faculties,—be it remembered that to aid us in ascending from the sensible to the spiritual, from the known to the unknown, is the special design of types. Let us, for aid, then, have recourse to type Adam. Let us study the antitype in the type, the transitive nature of the spiritual in the transitive nature of the animal, and our dim thoughts will thereby acquire a definiteness which nothing so well as the type could possibly impart. In this way we shall be enabled to ascend from the lower to the higher level of thought, and seize on the substantive through the shadowy, the unknown through the known, Christ through Adam. (See Rom. v., 17.)

"How refreshing to our faith and meditations, then, is the fact that in ascending toward the beginning of the world and the source of things, along that cordon of revelation on which Almighty God has decreed the faith of man shall rest, we behold, on reaching its higher terminus, Christ and Adam, standing before us in the relation of type and antitype,—the first link in religion, hooked and made fast, as it were, to the last link of creation,—Christ to Adam, who is thus the first man, the first type, and the first argument for the divine omniscience.

"In Christ Jesus, therefore, there is offered by heaven to humanity the glorious privilege of renewing its life and unity on an eternal basis, the second Adam, of which the animal basis, Adam the first, is but a shadow.

"As a type, Adam, like all other types, is designed to answer the following purposes ; that is :

"1. To define our conception of the spiritual.

"2. To display the divine omniscience.

"3. By this to lay in the soul of man the foundation of the inner government—the government of 'the reins and heart.'

"4. To display the wisdom and forecast of God in causing the past to minister to the future—Adam to Christ.

"5. And by this to prove the divine origin of the Bible.

"But as the regenerative, like the generative relation, is radical, and as it is the major relation between Christ and 'the children whom God has given him,' therefore, that we might meditate of the type and antitype with all possible distinctness, not only in their single and higher element of resemblance, but also in their many lower points of difference, the apostle, in 1 Corinthians xv., places them before us in strong contrast as the two dynamic units, and thereby offers to us a general privilege, an opportunity of contemplating our relations to each separately, under the antithesis of their respective order of details ; thus :

"1. 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.'

"2. As by a man came death, so by a man came the resurrection of the dead.

"3. There is an animal and there is a spiritual body.

"4. In Adam we lose our animal personality ; in Christ we gain a spiritual personality.

"5. The former is weak, corruptible, dishonored, and animal ; the latter is strong, incorruptible, glorious, and spiritual.

"6. The animal is first, the spiritual last.

"7. Adam was made a living soul ; Christ a quickening spirit.

"8. 'The first man was made of the earth, earthy ; the second man was the Lord from heaven.'

"9. As was the earthy, so shall they be who are earthy, and as is the heavenly, so shall they be who are heavenly.

"10. Flesh and blood (the animal) can not inherit the kingdom of God ; but the spiritual shall all be changed.

"11. 'Death shall be swallowed up in victory.'

"12. The regenerated in glory shall sing : 'O Death, where is thy sting ? O Grave, where is thy victory ? The sting of death is sin, the strength of sin is the law ; but thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ !'

"Here, then, by numerous distinct points of dissimilitude between

the animal and spiritual heads, our relations to them severally are brought still more decidedly within the grasp of our mind, the Holy Scriptures in this manner urging upon our convictions the following radical doctrine, namely, "That men are not isolations; 'that no man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself,' but all, both in nature and religion, in society and the church, exist under correlative incorporate heads; so that, whether our affinities are animal or spiritual, corporate and associated action are primordial laws of human nature. Human life is a life of relations in both its phases, animal and spiritual.

"Man, whose coming all preceding terrestrial orders had for untold ages presignified, by his fall became a mere sign in the world, a figure, a type, a symbol. Society and religion were thenceforth to be two distinct organisms, inspired with different spirits and appointed to very different destinies.

"With different dynamic units or heads, different principles, ordinances, manners, and customs, the temporary was to foreshadow the eternal, the finite the infinite, the animal the spiritual, the human the divine, Adam, Christ, till the race, by *genesis* and *regensis*, should at last renew its life and unity on an eternal basis, Christ Jesus our Lord.

"The Holy Scriptures, like the sun, the earth, and the heavens, are their own witnesses. Our duty, therefore, is to read them till we learn this—till we learn that life under Adam and Christ, the units of life, is double—animal and spiritual, temporal and eternal, and that the Scriptures, which speak of these and reveal them, certainly have for their author the omniscient God.

"As the rich harvest of the seeding-year indicates the necessities of mankind, and meets them with fruits and golden grains, so the Holy Scriptures indicate men's spiritual necessities, and meet them with a heavenly fruitage, various and excellent beyond compare."

G.

A BEAUTIFUL FANCY.—In the *Legend of the Tree of Life*, published in New York, in 1775, occurs the following: "Trees and woods have twice saved the world—first by the *ark*, then by the *cross*; making full amends for the evil fruits of the tree of Paradise, by *that* which was borne on the tree in Golgotha."

DR. JOHN MASON, in a very few sentences, has furnished an admirable analysis of true faith, thus: "Reliance is its essence, Christ is its object, the word is its food, and obedience is its proof; so that true faith is a depending upon Christ for salvation in a way of obedience as he is offered, in the word.

ATTITUDE IN PRAYER.

(From the Millennial Harbinger.)

IN the last article we called attention to the scriptural example and teaching of the participation of the congregation in the public prayers of the church. In the present article we shall briefly consider what the Bible teaches on the subject of the attitude of the body in that action of devotion. We are well aware that the worldly, carnal indifference of many, who have been schooled to regard and judge everything in religion from an easy, unspiritual, haughty stand-point, will lead them to treat a topic like this as of no value whatever in the life of their piety. This class, while they are what they are—proud, earthly-minded rationalists, are quite unable to understand the meaning and appreciate the value of the question. But even with a better class, with men of a certain degree of religiousness and real piety, the question may arise : “Of what matter is it what a man’s bodily position is in prayer?” and they are ready complacently to say, that the discussion of such topics is “tithing rue, mint, and cumin ;” is wasting time on matters of mere outward form that are of very little consequence and in which liberty must be granted. Moreover, the final answer of an easy, yielding religious thoughtlessness is, that it is in vain to war against taste and custom in such matters. To all such objections, we freely answer, that we can not be guided in our appreciation of religious questions by such suggestions ; we are not conscious of much respect for objections of this kind, coming from such quarters ; but, on the contrary, really always feel like looking upon them, from the first, with extreme suspicion. To listen to the voice of worldly custom and popular fashion in religious matters would, step by step, nullify in our hearts everything most precious in the word of God, and most estimable in the life of true piety. We are willing, with reverence and respect, to listen to suggestions coming from those eminent in piety and godliness, eminent for their reverence of the word of God, of the divine commandments ; who live after the Spirit and not after the flesh. But, above all, by the side of the Word and Spirit of the Holy Scriptures, we hold all such human wisdom of little or no esteem. Whatever these hold forth as allied to a life of godliness and piety, is to us of value and worthy of consideration and of acceptance. Now the Bible does abundantly, throughout its entire extent, give eminence and meaning, in example and precept, to attitude in prayer ; and therefore we do accept and treat it as a question of consequence to the conscience and piety of the Christian

church. If it is really a scriptural topic, what matters it to us that a worldly-wise Christian profession lightly esteems it, and what it may say against it?

From the earliest period of the Old Testament to the end of the New, examples on this subject abound; and biblical example, divinely approved, is a law to us. Another important fact is, the wonderful harmony of example over this long period, embracing almost two thousand years, and covering the institutions of both the Old and New Testaments; it is the same with Hebrew and Christian. Now what is so often repeated, and so enduring and so uniform in the life of piety, in the most solemn act of worship, of the soul's communion with God, illustrated in the lives of patriarchs, of the greatest of divinely chosen kings, of prophets and of apostles, and, above all, of the Son of God himself, must not be regarded and treated by us with indifference, as a matter of little value. It must teach us that there is a positive, real connection between the outward form and the inner spirit, between the motions of the body and the motions of the soul.

What, then, does the Bible teach us is the proper attitude in prayer? Let us trace its examples. At the conclusion of the prayer of King Solomon at the dedication of the temple, we read: "And it was so, that when Solomon had made an end of praying all this prayer and supplication unto the Lord, he arose from before the altar of the Lord, from kneeling on his knees with his hands spread up to heaven. And he stood, and blessed all the congregation," etc. (1 Kings viii., 54, 55.) An account of this same act is given in 2 Chron. vi., 13: "For Solomon had made a brazen scaffold of five cubits long, and five cubits broad, and three cubits high, and had set it in the midst of the court; and upon it he stood, and kneeled down upon his knees before all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven." This is a very circumstantial account. Solomon first ascended the scaffold or platform, and stood before the people; and then kneeled down to pray. He remained on his knees till the end of his prayer, which was long and fervent; and then rose up to bless the people, for which act the attitude of standing, as described, is a proper one. Kneeling, we implore; standing, we bless. The spreading forth of his hands was very significant, and was usual among the ancients, as the hand stretched out and upturned to heaven, indicated asking for a blessing which the hands were open to receive. The *manus supinæ*, the hands opened upward, the "palms turned toward heaven," is often referred to by the ancients in describing prayer. In blessing, the hands were reversed—opened downward, as giving to others. In the description of Ezra's prayer (ix., 5,) it is said: "And at the evening sacrifice I arose up from my heaviness; and having rent my garment and my mantle, I fell upon my knees, and spread out my hands unto the Lord my God." Daniel (vi., 10,) "Kneeled

upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." The Lord said to Elijah (1 Kings xix., 18) : "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed to Baal." Here the bowing of the knees is made synonymous with, and representative of, prayer, so entirely, in the Old Testament idea, did praying and kneeling coincide. The words of David in the Ninety-fifth Psalm are very expressive and instructive : "O come, let us worship and bow down ; let us kneel before the Lord our Maker." In the parallelism in this passage, "kneeling before the Lord our Maker" is but a repetition and modification of "worshiping and bowing down." Note that this is David's full common picture of prayer ; this was the image before his mind when he thought of prayer. Observe, moreover, the strength and poetic beauty of the language. "Kneeling before the Lord" is the full embodiment of this solemn act of worship, and its full representative and synonym, again, as in the words of God to Elijah ; so completely was the idea of kneeling interwoven with that of prayer and worship.

The passages we have thus quoted give us a true idea of the common practice of the Hebrews in this respect. The above instances represent both public and private prayer. This practice of Jewish piety and devotion is in harmony with the general custom of the Orient, from the oldest period to this day. Bowing down, kneeling, prostrating the body, before the Lord, were among the Jews always connected with the idea of prayer. The position of the outward body indicated the state of the soul, not by constraint, but the body readily, almost irresistibly, obeyed the strong dictates of the soul. This attitude is a true one, and one that the spirit desires and enjoys. It is not a mere arbitrary, constrained formality ; it is a beautiful, necessary harmony, to break which is to disturb the natural motions and currents of true devotion, and to constrain and restrain the soul. How often did the adoring or contrite Israelite throw himself with his whole body prostrate before God ! That, too, was in just obedience to the strong emotions of the soul ; to have resisted it would have been violence to these emotions, and disturbed and weakened the tide of devotion. These attitudes of the body are sanctioned and sanctified in the Old Testament by the highest and most uniform examples of piety, and by the divine acceptance ; nay, they stand before us as a *command* in the words of the psalmist :

"O come, let us worship and bow down !
Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker !"

It may perhaps be urged that there is one memorable instance of sitting, and not kneeling, in worship before God : "And David the king came and sat before the Lord," etc. (1 Chron. xvii., 16.) If this

were to represent the common, modern mode of sitting, it would be in singular discord with all that the Old Testament teaches of Jewish devotion. The mode of sitting, however, here referred to, and which has even to this day been very common in the East, is to sit kneeling. It is referred to in 1 Kings xviii., 42: "And Elijah went up to the top of Carmel; and he cast himself down upon the earth, and put his face between his knees." It was the attitude of kneeling, when the person had to maintain the same position for a long time, and was for the sake of relief. It is a strong argument in behalf of kneeling as essential to the Hebrew idea of waiting before God in prayer, when even in the case of long-protracted worship it was not omitted.

Between the Old Testament and the New, there were no changes in the simple modes of worship, in the outward forms of devotion, that belonged naturally, as a beautiful harmony, to the emotions and impulses of true piety. As the Fathers prayed to God, as Moses, and David, and the prophets, and the pious Jews, so Jesus and his disciples, before the full organization of the church of Christ, and so the Christians in the church, also prayed. Had there been any needless, merely Jewish, formality in these forms that were so retained, they would not have been by the Lord permitted to pass from the dispensation of the letter to that of the Spirit. According to the very law of the kingdom of Christ, nothing could be permitted by its Founder to enter into its constitution, in precept or practice, that is a mere useless ceremony; all in its worship and ordinances has a positive meaning and use; and whether the pride of human wisdom can understand and accept any of these forms or not is no argument against their true legitimacy and essential necessity.

We will now cite the New Testament examples. In the history of the solemn scenes of our Savior's agony in the garden, we read: "And he was withdrawn from them about a stone's cast, and kneeled down, and prayed." (Luke xxii., 41.) This example, in such beautiful harmony with the practice of the Old Testament, and so fully expressive of the state of the soul, alone is sufficient for a perpetual law to us. Will any one suppose that if this bodily act had been a mere outward formality, our Savior in this most solemn moment of his life, that distanced from him all that is not most real and most true, would have conformed to it? Let all those who treat this position of the body in prayer with neglectful indifference, in the midst of the church, look upon the Savior in the agony of the garden, and repent!

Another very remarkable instance is given us in the seventh chapter of Acts. In the dreadful agonies of martyrdom, when the infuriated Jews were stoning him to death, Stephen, the man "full of the Holy Spirit," whose "face shone as that of an angel," "kneeled down, and cried with a loud voice: Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!"

and then yielded up his spirit to God. Was this a moment for unmeaning, needless formality? Acts ix., 40, we read: "But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down and prayed." The example of Paul is also given: "And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down, and prayed with them all." (Acts xx., 36.) "And when we had accomplished those days, we departed and went our way; and they all brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city; and we kneeled down on the shore, and prayed." Here is as clear teaching from the New Testament practice as any man can desire. It is uniform and without controversy. In addition to all this, how very expressive are the words of Paul (Eph. iii., 13-19): "Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and in earth is named; that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passes knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God." Here again, as in cases above cited from the Old Testament, "bowing the knees" is an equivalent for prayer, showing that with the greatest expounder of Christian doctrine and life the outward and inward acts were so intimately allied that the former, in speech, represented the latter. This is a most noteworthy fact, that the greatest representatives and expounders of the piety of the Old Testament and of the New—the sweet Psalmist of Israel, King David, and the Apostle Paul, speak alike on this subject.

"O come, let us worship and bow down!
Let us kneel before the Lord our Maker!"

sings David; and so also Paul, as above: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The emotions and the manifestations of a true piety are the same in every age. There is, moreover, a peculiar force to us, in the question before us, in the language of Paul. The earnest, fervent, prayerful desires of Paul's soul for the spiritual joys and the salvation of his brethren was to him a cause for "bowing the knees!" Make these words symbolic as you please, they mean the same still. Why, then, is not a prayerful spirit a cause to all those who claim to imitate Paul "also to bow the knees to the Lord?" With hundreds of Christians whose special aim and pretense are to follow the "apostolic order of things in example and precept," as we have often observed in the public worship of the church, there is no such cause for "bowing the knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" a very wide difference must subsist between them and the great man of God—Paul the aged!

From the premises before us, in the precepts and examples of the Bible, so fully and beautifully illustrative of the piety of the Bible, it seems scarcely necessary to urge the question with one word more. Could the earnest, conscientious Christian, whose great desire it is to follow the letter and the spirit of the divine word in all things, ask anything more? And yet, in this respect too, what an abandonment of the form, and we doubt not of the spirit too, of true piety and prayer! The church is beginning shamefully to yield to the spirit of the world! Fashion and respectability are here also triumphing over the church. It is no longer "respectable" and "in good taste" for Christian people in good society to "worship and bow down; to kneel before God our Maker;" to "bow the knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." A slight, elegant bowing of the head is all that fashion now allows! To kneel before God in the church is subject to too many inconveniences. It is not in good tone; would look too pious for elegant, refined people; and above all, would greatly damage the splendid, fashionable garments of pious Christian men and women. David the king could do it; Daniel, the prime minister of a mighty empire, could do it; the Apostle Paul could even "kneel down on the sea-shore" with them all;—but Christians of good tone, of these days, can not do it. It is well that there is now no Paul here to ask so unreasonable, unrespectable a thing of our intelligent, higher-developed, fashionably attired Christians of to-day, as to kneel down on the bare ground! What would these have done had they, unfortunately, been with Paul on that memorable occasion? It is a bitter grief to see this shameful, and we fear too willing, succumbing to the dictates of a carnal respectability in so many of our churches! Often has our heart sunk within us, when rising from prayer, to see the whole congregation irreverently sitting in their seats, respecting this sublime act of devotion only with an idle resting of the head on the back of the pew before them. We always feel outraged at the mournful scenes of abandonment of the beautiful and blessed form of Bible piety to the spirit of the world. And why preachers permit such things to exist, without stern rebuke we can not understand. Let others who do not feel themselves bound by Bible practice, and who think that they can change Bible usage "somewhat," do this; but they who claim, *par excellence*, to adopt apostolic Christianity, in spirit and form, can not do it without a plain abandonment of their principles. C. L. L.

COMMENTS.

WE insert the foregoing piece entire for two reasons: 1. We wish the reader to have the benefit of all its author has to say in defense of the position which he maintains. 2. We are unwilling to be charged with the injustice so often done by publishing only parts of an article. By inserting the piece entire, that end is gained, and this avoided.

Is the attitude of the body in prayer a matter of importance? C. L. L. is out of all sorts of patience with those who chance to think it is not. On them he piles epithets at a most fearful rate. But did C. L. L. ever meet with a Christian who really regarded the attitude of the body in prayer as a matter of indifference? In candor I must say. I think he never did. In this part of his article he writes too much like one who is bent on the defense of a hobby. Here, at least, his piece is wanting in the repose of one who feels confident of having truth with him, and of the power to make his readers feel it. Had his article contained scores of adjectives less, with a fair induction of cases, and a just conclusion, it would have commanded a confidence to which, in its present form, it can lay but little claim. It is certainly not such a production as we should have expected from one who usually thinks so clearly and writes so well as its author. Its air of bluster is far below him; yet this air is precisely that of the whole class of those who take the position which he takes, and who reach the conclusion he reaches.

Almost every year, since the great work began in which we are engaged, have we been annoyed by some one springing up in our midst, who has rendered himself, if not famous, certainly notorious, by his pertinent and impertinent advocacy of some idolized topic. Among these topics, not the least has been the attitude of the body in prayer. We call to mind at this moment a brother who, when he is gone, will be remembered more for the course he has pursued on this theme than for anything else his life is likely to yield. That the theme is a legitimate one for a short passionless discussion, we shall not deny; but the necessity does not exist for writing on it with the vehemence with which C. L. L. writes. His effort resembles that of a man who should, for half a day, ring all the bells in St. Paul's, London, and call thousands of people together merely to sell them a pocket-comb. But to the point.

I do not believe that there lives one Christian man of whom it can be truly said, he regards the attitude of the body in prayer as indifferent or unimportant. All, without exception, as far as I know, hold the true attitude to be either kneeling or standing. To this I have not met an exception. They hold both attitudes to be allowable and equally acceptable; and hence that neither is better than the other. Consequently, when they treat attitude in prayer as matter of indifference, what they mean is, that it is matter of indifference *which one* of these *two* attitudes only we shall assume; and not that it is matter of indifference whether we reject them both or assume something different from either. Within these narrow limits, and within these only, is the question of attitude held to be indifferent. When, therefore, it is alleged of any one that he is indifferent as to attitude in prayer, there is an ambiguity in the allegation which it was incum-

bent on C. L. L. to point out, but which he failed to do. This renders one part of his piece confused and unjust.

As further evidence that the indifference exists only within the limits just named, let us take the conduct of the very class of persons said to be indifferent. They always either kneel or stand, and never assume any other attitude. They stand in the public prayer, and universally kneel in the social or family prayer. One of these attitudes, therefore, they always assume, and never deem that they may assume neither. This extent hath their indifference, no more. Whether they assign sufficient reasons, *if any be needed*, to justify their standing in the public prayer instead of kneeling, assuming both attitudes to be allowable, is a question upon the discussion of which we have no inclination to enter. When C. L. L. sets down standing in the public prayer to pride or fashion, or unwillingness to soil a fine garment, in a word, to unwillingness to kneel, springing from any unworthy cause, he assumes to do what God alone may do—invade the sanctuary of the human heart and judge his brethren. Certainly it is not impossible that a few might stand through pride; but I should think it the judgment of charity to conclude that such instances never actually occur. That a Christian man should stand in prayer, when he knows it to be his duty to kneel, is an immorality too gross to be imputed to him except on indisputable proof.

Of course, the indifference of which we speak, which is confined between kneeling and standing, is justifiable only on the supposition that both kneeling and standing are allowable attitudes. Is this, then, the case? We believe it is; and for so believing shall proceed to assign reasons.

But before doing this we must notice still further C. L. L.'s piece. The article is defective in two respects: 1. As an induction, it is incomplete precisely where it should have been full. 2. Its conclusion is only a part of the truth.

Certainly the cases cited by C. L. L. from the Old Testament and New, fully warrant the conclusion that kneeling has the divine sanction, and is therefore right. This conclusion has our cordial assent; nor do we believe that even so much as one voice can be found in all the land against it. This much, therefore, we at once settle, and settle it finally. But is this the only conclusion warranted by the Holy Scriptures? We are satisfied it is not; and it is just at this point that the fact begins to appear that C. L. L.'s conclusion is only a part of the truth. He is writing of attitude in prayer, attitude generally. Why, then, did he cite only those passages which speak of kneeling? He knew perfectly that there are other passages which speak of other attitudes; yet he has ignored them. This looks much like the work of a special pleader.

The first case he cites from the New Testament is the example of the Savior kneeling on the Mount of Olives. This is taken from Luke

But why treat so cavalierly the passage in Matthew, which gives a *different* attitude. The passage runs thus: "And he went a little farther, and *fell on his face*, and prayed." (xxvi., 39.) Here *falling on the face* is as clearly shown to be an attitude in prayer as is kneeling. It hence has all the force of a precedent, and is therefore as binding on us of the present day as is kneeling. Yet C. L. L. does not insist on falling on the face. Kneeling is his pet attitude.

Now clearly the fair and just conclusion from the premises thus far before us is, that both kneeling and falling on the face have the Savior's sanction. They are hence both right and equally allowable. Whether, then, a Christian in prayer kneel or fall on his face is clearly a matter of indifference. He may do either, or at different times may do both. Which he shall do is left wholly with himself. Nothing outside of himself, nothing either in the divine example or in the nature of the case itself, has anything to do in determining his choice. Of this he is the sole author; and hence his decision is right.

But we have other Scriptures in which still a different attitude is shown to be right. We adduce first the following: "And the publican, *standing* afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes to heaven; but smote upon his breast, saying: God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other." (Luke xviii., 13, 14.) This is from the lips of the Savior. That it is cited by him with approbation I shall not argue. A man *may* then make an acceptable prayer to God standing. In other words, his attitude does not determine the character of his prayer. This is done by the state of his heart. Hence, his heart being right, he may pray kneeling, standing, or falling on his face, and his prayer will be accepted. No conclusion can be better warranted than this. But in reply, it may be said that the Savior cites the case to approve the humility of the publican, not his attitude in prayer. But of the truth of this there is no evidence. Certainly the Savior approves his humility, but did he disapprove his attitude? If so, he has left us no evidence of the fact.

We quote next the following: "And when ye *stand*, praying, forgive, if ye have aught against any, that your Father also, who is in heaven, may forgive your trespasses." (Mark xi., 25.) Now whatever may be said of the case of the publican, this case at least admits of no doubt. That standing is here shown to be a divinely approved attitude in prayer is indisputable. No ingenuity can evade it, nor can even daring itself deny it. Hence kneeling, falling on the face, and standing, are all allowable attitudes in prayer. Which one of these shall be preferred for any given occasion is a point not easily decided. Indeed, the point is one we deem of very little moment. The examples of the Savior, Stephen, and Paul, taken together, would seem to warrant the conclusion that in seasons of deep distress and sorrow,

kneeling is the most appropriate attitude. To this conclusion we strongly incline as the true one. When the soul is overwhelmed in grief, kneeling or falling on the face seems best to accord with its state. But in all those passages in which we forgive or seek forgiveness, standing, according to the passage last cited, as well as that of the publican, would seem the preferable attitude. But on these points we lay no stress. In the public congregation we prefer to see all stand ; in the social circle, to see all kneel. But whichever attitude shall be adopted, on this we must insist, that all shall alike conform to it. To see one part of a congregation standing during prayer, another part kneeling, and still a third part sitting, is an irregularity, to say the least of it, for which there is no excuse, certainly no justification. Let all stand, all kneel, or all fall on the face. And this is a question which each congregation should determine for itself. To do this would be an easy task. Let the matter be brought before the church for its consideration. Let all the Scriptures be read before it, in which attitude in prayer is named. Then let the church say by its majority which one of these attitudes it will adopt. Henceforth the practice of the church should be one. Not an alienation should follow, nor a dissenting voice be heard. The acquiescence should be cordial, and the harmony faultless.

Before dismissing the topic we beg to enter our protest against two reprehensible practices we often witness in the public prayer. We allude, first, to the practice of sitting. For this there is certainly an excuse in cases of great feebleness and infirmity, no matter from what cause it may arise. But in the case of the well, there is not even the semblance of an excuse. For them to sit is most irreverent indeed. But, as a general rule, a few private, gentle words from the preacher or the overseer is all that is necessary to insure an immediate reformation. We have not known one instance in which this course failed. In most cases, indeed, a general request kindly made from the pulpit is all that is needed.

We allude, secondly, to the practice of looking idly about over the congregation while standing in prayer. It is difficult to see how those who do it can feel any interest in the prayer, or how they are to be benefited by it. Certainly it is not going too far to say that their obvious indifference is very dangerous, if it be not positively criminal. Let all our preachers call attention to the practice wherever they minister, and insist on its immediate correction ; and in less than twelve months, we venture to say, little necessity will exist to complain of the evil. Many of these irregularities are the result of mere thoughtlessness. In all such cases, a few well-timed sentences from the preacher is all that is needed to effect the required change. At least, let us not censure our brethren too severely till gentler remedies have been tried. When these have failed, then let the caustic be applied.

1866.

THE year 1866 has passed away. Its events have been faithfully enrolled in the Unseen, to be reproduced when "God requireth that which is past." Never had we studied the progressive steps of any year with more quiet or more singular interest. We measured its months. We reckoned its weeks. We considered its days. And when the final knell sounded its departure, we forcibly felt how uncertain are the presages of men. We have thus seen, within our own horizon, two great predictions fail. In the first, we had no confidence whatever. In the second, we can not say we had faith ; but, still, with the consciousness that good and great men had predicted a momentous crisis in the affairs of the world, we endeavored by quiet induction to form a fair conclusion. There seemed to be confident expectation on the part of faithful and intelligent men of the church. The events of the last eighteen years seemed to converge with directness toward a decided point. The violent convulsions on our own continent ; the sudden and complete overthrow of the great papal power of the Old World, making a most material change in the map of Continental Europe ; the sad extremity of his "Holiness the Pope ;" the late marshaling of the "Great Powers," *all* seemed to warrant a conclusion that a great crisis was at hand. Indeed, it may be so now. Judging by the record of inspiration, sudden and terrible convulsions will be the sign and signal of the change from the present order of things. That there is an overruling and directing Providence in the affairs of men, no true historian questions. There is certainly a grand objective idea in life. There is surely a reliable logic in the great progressive events of history. There must be an instructive experience in the annals of earth. Does history continually seem to repeat itself in vain ? Must man forever mourn over the failures of man ? Notwithstanding the seeming contradictions and profitless experience of the world, there is a positive process going on—a true spiritual progress toward a higher life. It is in the office and mission of the church. Indeed, the final cause of this present life is the glory of God in the triumph of the church over the prince of this world. Thus an issue between the church and the world, a conflict between truth and error, good and evil, is patent in the patient explorer, amid the ruins and the rubbish with which the pages of profane history are so heavily laden. It is a conceded point in sacred history. Indeed, it is the cardinal idea of revelation, of redemption.

Christ in history is the practical manifestation of God's purpose toward man. The great instrument and agent in God's providence is

silently, but most forcibly, at work. Nations and individuals fulfill their mission in subordination to this great, sovereign end. His "ways are not as our ways." "Surely the wrath of man shall praise thee: the remainder of wrath shalt thou restrain." Though "clouds and darkness are round about him, righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne." The life of man is short, and the march of God is slow, although "a thousand years in his sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." The *rationale* of history is the providence of God. Let us briefly consider this proposition. We have stood amid the deserted fanes of Egypt, Carthage, Greece, Rome, Palmyra, and beheld in the very ruins themselves, most eloquent monuments of the perishable power, grandeur, and glory of earthly empires, and of the certainty of God's judgments on all that is false. Great nations had existed there. Proud hearts had beat there with a hope as high, a purpose as confident, and aspirations as fervent as those of the mighty men of this day at London, Paris, Berlin, St. Petersburg, and Washington. What *those* were, *these* are; and what *those are*, *these will be*. *It is written*: "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." Indeed, history seemingly moves in a circle when man bounds his sphere by the sensuous. Whenever he becomes the slave of sense, he never advances into the realm of the positive, the permanent, and the spiritual. The purpose of sensuous man is the same now as in the days of Nimrod or Cyrus, Alexander or Cæsar, and his fate will be the same. National lives will perish whenever they are conditioned and limited by the sensuous. The spiritual alone is imperishable. Daniel, by inspiration, established this truth nearly twenty-five centuries ago, which has been progressively confirmed by history. And here we must express our wonder that that wonderful book is so little studied. The Book of Daniel should be a manual for kings and presidents. It is the master-key to all national histories, and in the everlasting dominion it is an epitome of all history. It determines the fate of the sensuous, and develops the destiny of the spiritual. It declares the subjection of all earthly kingdoms to the saints of the Most High. That day, we think, is fast approaching. Philosophy has long since exhausted its resources. "The world by wisdom knew not God." Earthly governments are fast exhausting their power. The prediction of Daniel will as certainly be verified, as has been the declaration of Paul. The Lord is overruling all, even the disputes of sectarianism, in favor of the church. Let us take courage, my beloved brethren, in the sublime confidence that knows no fear, in the blessed assurance that Christianity is God in history, and that its great mission, its sovereign purpose, will be fully accomplished. May we truly realize the solemn responsibilities that devolve upon us as members of the body of

Christ—of the everlasting kingdom ! Let us be more prayerful, more earnest, and more devoted this year than we have ever been ! Let us exhibit the spirit of peace and love in all our ways, in all our works ! May the Lord help us to do his holy will ! “ Take ye heed, watch and pray ; for ye know not when the time is.” “ WATCH !”

WHAT IS RELIGION ?

BY HEBER.

Is it to go to church to-day,
To look devout and seem to pray,
And ere to-morrow's sun goes down
Be dealing slander through the town ?

Does every sanctimonious face
Denote the certain reign of grace ?
Does not a phis that scowls at sin
Oft veil hypocrisy within ?

Is it to make our daily walk,
And of our own good deeds to talk,
Yet often practice secret crime,
And thus mis-spend our precious time ?

Is it for sect and creed to fight,
To call our zeal the rule of right,
When what we wish is, at the best,
To see our church excel the rest ?

Is it to wear the Christian dress,
And love to all mankind profess,
To treat with scorn the humble poor,
And bar against them every door ?

Oh, no ! religion means not this,
Its fruit more sweet and fairer is ;
Its precept 's this—To others do
As you would have them do to you.

It grieves to hear an ill report,
And scorns with human woes to sport ;
Of others' deeds it speaks no ill,
But tells of good, or else keeps still.

And does religion this impart ?
Then may its influence fill my heart ;
Oh ! haste the blissful, joyful day,
When all the world may own its sway !

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1867.

No. 2

THE EDITOR'S THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.

THIS able and interesting essay has been before the public two full years ; and up to this time it has not received that attention which its own character, and the position, ability, and influence of its author, justly demand for it. If that theory is correct, its correctness should be more fully evinced, and the brotherhood more fully impressed with its truth. If incorrect, in whole or in part, its errors should be pointed out and refuted. The vindication of the theory may properly be left to its author. If true, no one is more capable than he of adducing and logically applying the scriptural evidences of its truth.

Though this theory purports to be based upon the Scriptures, and to result from their true and proper interpretation, it is worthy of remark that in the essay itself the author is merely enunciating his theory, as a theme for the profitable study of his readers, not attempting a demonstration of its truth. In reference to one point adduced, he says : "Should any one cavil at this, and say it is without proof, we beg to remind him that we are inditing a theory—nothing more." This was, doubtless, sufficient for the purposes of that essay. Still the theory thus indited is made up of a series of affirmative propositions, on the truth of which depends the correctness of the theory as a whole. It is no more than just, therefore, it seems to me, that the editor should now be called upon for the proofs and arguments by which the truth of those several propositions may be rendered fully apparent.

It is not at present so much my purpose to controvert the editor's theory, as to eliminate the several affirmative propositions on which it rests, and indicate the necessity of their being accompanied by such evidences of their truth as their author may have at his command.

Perhaps the most appropriate starting-point in this work is the definition of the word millennium. The following is the editor's definition of this term : "The term, as many of our readers well know, is derived from the Latin, *mille*, a thousand, and *annus*, a year. It hence means a thousand years. And although it is not found in the New

Testament (and he might have added, or in the Old Testament either), yet the expression 'a thousand years' is, and this expression and the term are used to denote the same thing. These thousand years, however, are not a thousand ordinary years, but a thousand glorious years, to which Christians, from the earliest ages of the church, have been looking forward with the deepest solicitude. These thousand years of sinless and painless bliss constitute the millennium. Such is the meaning of the term, and such the period it denotes."

To determine whether or not this definition is correct, is of primary importance. On the decision of this point depends, in a great measure, the fate of the editor's entire theory. Moreover, millennialists will not all subscribe to this definition. That part of it which relates to the primary and radical meaning of the word, is unquestionable; but the balance of the definition is not only debatable, but will certainly be debated. If correct, the editor should evince its correctness by indubitable proofs. This portion of the definition rests upon two distinct affirmative propositions:

1. That there will be, on this earth, a period of "sinless and painless bliss."

Is this proposition true? Where is it taught? Here is the place to begin. Let the editor adduce his proofs and arguments. This point should be placed beyond controversy before another step is taken. This truth, if it be a truth, should be made to rise "something above mere feeble conjecture." If this be not true, the whole theory necessarily falls. But if true, while that would not imply the correctness of the entire theory, the demonstration of this point will be an important step toward a vindication of the whole theory. For my own part, I, at present, neither affirm nor deny this proposition. It is enough to say, that though I do not believe it, I am, I trust, entirely open to conviction,—ready carefully and candidly to examine any proofs and arguments that may be advanced in its favor.

2. But even if this proposition be true, it will not follow that this period of "sinless and painless bliss" will be precisely a thousand years in duration; and that it is the same period indicated by the phrase "a thousand years," in the 20th chapter of Revelation. This, therefore, also requires proof.

If the first of these propositions is true, and the second one false, we have no means of determining the duration of that period of "sinless and painless bliss." It may be but of short duration, or it may last for countless ages. It may be properly called a millennium, or it may not. It may be before the second advent of Christ, or it may be after. In short, to identify this period of "sinless and painless bliss" with the thousand years of Revelation 20th is indispensable, and is logically the second step necessary in order to maintain the editor's theory and his definition of the word millennium.

If it be decided that there is to be a period of "sinless and painless bliss" on this earth, and that this period is the millennium, then one of the questions propounded in the *Quarterly*, Vol. III., p. 129, to wit: "Will wicked men live on earth during the millennium?" is at once answered in the negative. For if wicked men were living on the earth during that time, the period could not be characterized as "sinless;" and since wherever there is sin there is also misery, neither could it be characterized as "painless." The editor's definition of the word millennium, therefore, if true, settles this question. This theory is, that there will be a millennium of "sinless and painless bliss,"—a thousand years in which there will be no wicked men on earth, and consequently no pain. In his own terse language, permit me to add: "If so, where is the proof?" The *onus* justly rests on him who affirms that there will be such a period, not on him who denies it.

Then comes the next question: If wicked men are not to live on the earth during the millennium, "what will become of them before that event commences?" It is for the editor to answer. It is his theory that makes an answer necessary. These questions may be "curious" and "interesting," but, as propounded in the *Quarterly*, they throw the *onus* of proof upon the wrong party. I do not attempt to answer them. It is enough for me on these points to say, that during all the millenniums of the past—that is, all the thousands of years which have passed from the creation of man to the present time,—wicked men have lived on the earth. If there is to be a millennium, a thousand years, at any time in the future, in which they will not live on the earth, let those who so affirm bring forward their proofs.

Though it is not my purpose at present to argue the negative side of this question, one difficulty strikes me just at this point as worthy of the special attention of those who take the affirmative, and especially the editor. If the millennium is to be a period of sinless and painless bliss, during which no wicked men will live on the earth, whence come the Gog and Magog, "the number of whom is as the sand of the sea," who are to "compass the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city," immediately after the expiration of the editor's millennium? I am aware of the answer which he has given in commenting upon Prof. Stewart's work, *Quarterly*, Vol. II., p. 215, viz., "these nations are the wicked inhabitants of earth, raised in the second resurrection." But there are several serious difficulties in the way of this answer:

1. It may be difficult to prove, by any fair reasoning and correct exegesis of Scripture, that there are literally to be two resurrections—that of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and that of the wicked at its close.

2. But even if this be so, still this compassing the camp of the saints and the beloved city by the armies of Gog and Magog, and

their utter overthrow, all take place before "the second resurrection." For it is after this that John says : " And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God ; and the books were opened ; and another book was opened, which was the book of life ; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hades gave up the dead which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their works."

Other difficulties in the way of this answer will be developed in the course of the investigation of the subject.

As approaching, perhaps, somewhat nearer the main features, the grand outlines, of the editor's theory, I would call attention to the following sentences : " Of the beast and the false prophet, I am candid to say, I can speak with no sort of confidence. Of the various theories which have been published respecting them, I have seen none which has given my own mind any degree of satisfaction. I wish it were in my power to gratify the intense desire for information on this point, which I know the reader must feel ; but it is not." Nothing is more commendable, or more worthy of imitation, than both the candor and modesty displayed in this language. To imitate at least the candor of the editor, I will say that, whether correct or not, my conception of the objects indicated by "the beast and the false prophet" are clear and distinct. But I am not developing a theory of my own, merely examining that of the editor. And I allude to this subject here merely to indicate my conception of the difficulty, not of developing a theory of the millennium, but of proving it true, or even having any good degree of confidence in its truth, without first deciding who or what this beast and false prophet are. I regret the editor's inability to give us some definite idea of the nature of these objects, not as a matter of idle curiosity, but because it indicates, as I think, an exceedingly weak point in his theory. Let us see.

This theory, at least in its main outlines, is based upon the 19th and 20th chapters of Revelation. Among the most prominent objects in the 19th chapter, are the beast and the false prophet. The catastrophe, the great denouement of the vision recorded in that chapter, is the final overthrow of the beast and the false prophet, with their adherents, and the casting of the former into the lake of fire and brimstone. "These both were cast alive into the lake burning with fire and brimstone." So, too, in the 20th chapter, one of the most prominent objects presented to view is the dragon, which is also called the serpent, the devil, and satan. The catastrophe of this object is thus there recorded : "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever !"

Now, whatever may be represented by the dragon, the beast, and

the false prophet, it is evident that their final catastrophe is the same, their place of consignment the same. Nor does their close connection begin with their being consigned to the lake of fire and brimstone ; for in chapter 16th we read : " And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet." And even as far back as the 11th chapter we find something bearing on this point : " And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion, and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority."

This is not the proper point in the investigation of this subject, for me to attempt to define what these three objects are, or rather what they represent. I am only endeavoring to show how difficult it will be to attempt any exposition of the Apocalypse, or even of the 19th and 20th chapters, or to indicate any satisfactory theory of the millennium, without first ascertaining what is the representative meaning of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet.

But the editor obviates this difficulty so far as the dragon is concerned. He invariably speaks of him as the Devil and Satan, and evidently understands that it is literally and properly *the* Devil, the grand arch-enemy of God and man, that is alluded to. Now, this is more than questionable. It is, as I think, clearly wrong. However devilish, however satanic, the dragon may have been,—and surely no one will call in question his title to these characteristics,—still he was not really and literally the Devil, or Satan, but was " a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads." He was called the devil, not because he was the Devil, but because he was devilish. He was called satan, not because he was Satan, but because he was satanic. These terms were applied to him for the same reason that the term "satan" was applied to Peter, "the devil" to Judas, "that fox" to Herod, "and lamb" to Christ; still it is the dragon that is called the devil and satan, not the devil and satan that is called the dragon. If there is any authority for the popular belief that the time will come on this earth when Satan, not the dragon who is figuratively called satan, but literally and truly Satan himself, the spirit that works in the hearts of the children of disobedience, will actually and literally be laid hold upon by an angel, who has come down from heaven with a "key" and "a great chain in his hand," and be bound with that chain, and be shut up in the abyss, when he will cease to lead the wicked captive at his will and to cast his fury-shafts at the righteous, when saints will no longer need to watch and pray lest they enter into temptation, I know not where to find it.

I now arrive at a point which appears to underlie all the difficulties on this subject, and which must also be settled before any real progress can be made in developing a scriptural theory of the millennium. I refer to the proper method of interpreting the prophetic visions of the Apocalypse. This I propose to discuss somewhat more at length and in detail; and I accept thankfully the aid which the editor, in his interesting essay, has furnished on this point.

The editor says: "In order that we may proceed the more understandingly, it is proper here to say, that the scenes of which we are now speaking—the millennium, with its closely antecedent and its closely subsequent events—were all scenes shown in vision to the Apostle John, in Patmos. He there saw them in the form of a grand panorama. To him they were mere luminous types, but types of real events then lying deep in the distant future. What he then saw by the spirit of inspiration he has jotted down. We are now engaged in an effort to read his hand-writing, or interpret his hieroglyphics." The same remarks will apply equally well to all the visions of John.

The only thing in this paragraph to which I except is the word "types." The analogy between a type and its antitype, it strikes me, is too close, too apparent, to fittingly represent the analogy between the objects seen by John in his visions, and the objects represented by them. The word "hieroglyphics," however, suggests analogies much more resembling those of these visions. To "interpret his hieroglyphics" is, perhaps, as suggestive of the proper mode of interpreting these visions, as any expression that could be used.

In the next paragraph the editor says: "As to the sense in which we expect to take these sentences, a few words are thought necessary. The disposition, so long and so widely prevalent, to convert difficult or disagreeable Scriptures into mere figures of speech, and to make them mean anything or nothing, as may happen to suit the whim of the writer, has been the source of incalculable mischief and error. No book has suffered more from this disposition than the Book of Revelation. In it men have found ample room for the wildest gambols of fancy, and most wildly has fancy gamboled therein. If this could be set down simply to a desire to understand the book, it could well be viewed as comparatively innocent, but when it is adopted as a method of interpretation, it is difficult to censure it too sharply. By this we do not mean that the Book of Revelation contains no difficult passages; we know of no book that contains more. Neither do we mean to say that it contains no passages which are to be interpreted figuratively. Certainly no book of the New Testament contains so many. Its language is for the most part confessedly figurative, its conceptions are highly wrought, while the drapery of its scenes is gorgeous, even up to the height of sublimity. We simply mean to express the belief that a more literal method of interpreta-

tion than the one in general use is both applicable to the Book of Revelation, and necessary, in order to elicit its true meaning. We shall hence adopt it. Accordingly, in the sections of which we are about to treat, we shall assume that the main thread of thought is literally expressed ; in other words, that it lies out upon the surface in the most obvious meaning of the language used, and that it is not to be sought in some enigmatical or fancied sense thereof. But it is necessary that I shall express myself still more fully. When, then, I use the word literal, I do not mean by it the tame literalism of inornate narrative, but the absence of a purely symbolic style. As an illustration, I mean that the sections to be treated of will be construed much as we interpret the 53d chapter of Isaiah. To interpret this chapter very literally would certainly not be allowable ; to interpret it very far otherwise, as certainly not right ; to avoid these extremes is about all I aim at."

I have here reproduced the whole paragraph, lest the reader might not take the pains to turn back and re-peruse it.

If such a plain, matter-of-fact man as I am can be supposed to have anything which can properly be called "fancy," I will try to restrain its gambols within due bounds. But even if my fancy should gambol "most wildly," I ask that, in charity, it may be "set down simply to a desire to understand the book," for I feel conscious of being actuated by no other motive. But, although I am in search of "a method of interpretation," I have no desire for one consisting merely, or mainly, or at all, in "the wildest gambols of fancy." And surely I desire to discover some method of interpretation which will not result in making the book "mean anything or nothing, as may happen to suit the whim of the writer." I wish a method that will elicit its true meaning. What shall it be?

The editor says : "Accordingly, in the sections of which we are about to treat, we shall assume that the main thread of thought is literally expressed ; in other words, that it lies out upon the surface, in the most obvious meaning of the language used." Now, in the most obvious meaning of this language, I subscribe to it unreservedly ; and yet it is evident to me that the editor and myself differ, *toto cœlo*, as to the proper method of interpreting John's visions. Let me illustrate. To do so I quote the following words from Daniel : "Thou, O king, sawest and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold ; his breast and his arms were of silver ; his belly and his thighs of brass ; his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay," etc. Now, in this, I "assume that the main thread of thought is literally expressed ; in other words, that it lies out upon the surface in the most obvious meaning of the language used." Daniel is describing what the king had seen in his

vision, and he does so in a plain and unfigurative manner. In the same literal manner does John describe what he saw in his vision; not, perhaps, without an occasional trope, metaphor, or simile, but in such a manner that "the main thread of thought," that is, an account of what he saw in his visions, "lies out upon the surface in the most obvious meaning of the language used." The difficulty does not lie in the words used to describe what was seen, but in the things seen themselves. Those are plain and literal enough; these are the "hieroglyphics" to be interpreted. If the editor means that the meaning of the objects seen, as well as the meaning of the words used to describe them, are equally "obvious," and "lie out upon the surface," I beg leave respectfully to dissent.

The editor says: "When, then, I use the word literal, I do not mean by it the tame literalism of inornate narrative (neither do I); but the absence of a purely symbolic style." I am not satisfied that the adjective "symbolic" can be properly used to qualify the noun "style." The words do not belong to the same category. The symbolism is in the things seen and described; not at all in the style of the language used to describe them. But if the editor means that the objects seen by John in his visions were simple realities, and not of a symbolic or representative character, then I beg leave again to dissent. But I am satisfied he can not mean this; for in commenting upon verses 17 and 18, chapter 19th, he says: "John saw an angel standing in the sun, and heard him say, with a loud voice, to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, 'Come and be gathered together to the great supper of God.' This, as previously stated, was to John a vision, a picture; but a picture of what? We can not have a picture without its being a picture of something. What now is the thing or scene of which we have here the picture or representation? Does the sun, in John's vision, stand for the real sun, the angel for a real angel, the fowls for real fowls of earth, the supper for a real supper which they are literally to eat? If not, then, John saw not the picture of a corresponding reality, but the picture of a non-corresponding reality; and what can this be? Again: is it safer to interpret this vision as having its counterpart in a real angel, real fowls, and a real supper, or in having no reference whatever to these realities? I confess I am tied down to uncertainty. The great difficulty in interpreting the Book of Revelation is not in understanding the things which John saw. These he causes us to see very plainly. In other words, he describes to us his pictures well; but the difficulty lies in our inability to determine what the various parts of his pictures represent. Where he explains, of course, we have no difficulty; we have it only where he does not explain. In the verses in hand, it must be confessed, we have no explanation. In the absence of any, then, in what sense shall we take them? As involving, perhaps, the

least risk, I shall take them as containing pictures of corresponding realities ; that is, I shall understand the picture of fowls as representing fowls, and the picture of a supper as representing real eating."

This, then, is the editor's "method of interpretation." The object seen represents itself, or it represents a perfect *fac simile* of itself—its exact counterpart. If this method will elicit the true meaning of John's visions, then certainly have I studied the subject of prophetic visions, as exhibited in both Testaments, utterly in vain. If it does not display the "wildest gambols of fancy," it is, in my judgment, quite as unsafe as though it did ; and is a method of interpretation which it would be difficult to "censure too sharply." Without intending to be dogmatic, I wish to express my exceedingly strong conviction that neither the visions recorded in the 19th and 20th of Revelation, nor any of the other visions of John, nor any prophetic vision recorded in either Testament, will bear to be interpreted after this fashion. Did the "three branches" of the vine seen by Pharaoh's butler, in his vision, represent three real branches of a real vine ? Did the "three white baskets" seen by his chief baker represent three real baskets ? Did the "seven kine, fat-fleshed and well-favored," and the "seven other kine, very ill-favored and lean-fleshed," which Pharaoh saw in his vision, merely represent "seven kine" of each of the descriptions named ? Did the "great image" which the king of Babylon saw merely represent just such a great image ? Did "the tree in the midst of the earth" which the king saw in his second vision only represent a real tree ? Did the "four great beasts" which Daniel, in his first vision, saw "come up from the sea, diverse one from another," merely represent four just such great beasts ? Did the ram and the he-goat seen by him in his second vision merely represent a ram and a he-goat ? Was the "woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars," merely a "picture of a corresponding reality ?" that is, the woman represent a real woman, and she clothed with the real sun, and the real moon under her feet, and upon her head a real crown of twelve real stars ? Did she really give birth to a child in the real heaven ? Did "the great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads," and "whose tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven," merely represent just such a great dragon, whose tail either has or will exert such tremendous power ? Did the beast of the 13th chapter represent a real beast, such as is there described ? And, to come down to the 19th chapter, is it possible that any man can seriously believe that the "armies which were in heaven," and which followed the Word of God "upon white horses, clothed in white linen, white and clean," was intended to represent real animals, upon real white horses (i. e., an

army of cavalry), clothed with real fine linen, white and clean ; and all these in the real heavens ? If not, why should any person suppose the sun, the fowls, and the supper of verses 17 and 18, to represent the real sun, real fowls, and a real supper ? Why should the objects and scenes described in the 20th chapter be supposed to represent corresponding realities ?

I have before excepted to the word "type," as not indicating the true relation between the objects and scenes described by John, and those represented thereby. I now raise the same objection to the word "picture," not that either of these words are wholly inappropriate ; they may help to explain our conception of the analogy between the symbol and the thing or scene symbolized, only we must not use these words too literally. In one sense, these visions were highly pictorial, yet not in the sense of one being the exact counterpart of the other. The hieroglyphics of the ancient Egyptians were a "species of picture-writing, which expressed a series of ideas by representations of visible objects ;" but the pictures did not necessarily nor ordinarily represent what the editor calls "corresponding realities ;" yet each picture did represent a reality, such as the editor calls a "non-corresponding reality." Each picture had its symbolic import,—was a symbol, a representation (picture and type, if you choose,) of something. But sometimes, indeed generally, the relation between the picture and that of which it was a picture,—the type and the antitype, the symbol and the thing symbolized, the representation and the thing represented,—was as arbitrary as that existing between a word and the idea which that word is forced to express.

All this is equally true in regard to the apocalyptic hieroglyphics which we are now trying to interpret. Each object seen in vision is a hieroglyphic, a symbol, a type, a picture, a representation, of some real thing or scene, only you must not look for too close a resemblance, too obvious an analogy between the representation and the thing represented. The representative character of the symbol has been affixed to it arbitrarily by him through whose influence these visions were seen. The analogy may be slight between the object seen and the object represented. We may not know, we may not be able to learn, why one object is made to represent or symbolize another and, in most respects, entirely different object ; yet such is undoubtedly the case in regard to these prophetic visions.

This may seem like opening the door for the "wildest gambols of fancy ;" may tend to make these visions "mean anything or nothing, as may happen to suit the whim of the writer ; but if so, I can not help it. Enough of these visions have been interpreted by angels and inspired men to demonstrate the proposition, that the objects seen in these visions seldom, if ever, represent what the editor calls "corresponding realities." How, then, shall we learn what they do repre-

sent? This is the grand question. As the editor says, of John's vision : "When he explains, of course, we have no difficulty ; we have it only where he does not explain." So it can be said of all prophetic visions. Still, a few sober, earnest reflections may assist us in the task.

1. We should bear in mind that these visions all come from God ; their nature and character are fixed by him. This is clearly evident from what is said of the visions of Pharaoh's baker and butler, the visions of Pharaoh himself, those of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, and those of John.

2. Since God is a God of method and order, it is legitimate to infer that these visions are all subject to one uniform law, and to be interpreted in the same manner ; that is, that when we learn the symbolic import of an object seen in one vision, we will understand it to represent the same or a similar thing if seen in another vision. For instance, when we have learned that a beast seen in the vision by Daniel represents a kingdom, empire, or government, it is fair to understand it to represent the same when seen by John in his vision. If we are satisfied that the dragon of Revelation 12th represents the pagan Roman empire, we can not understand the same dragon, as seen in the vision of the 20th chapter, to represent the Devil. And so of all the other symbols employed in these visions.

3. These visions must be interpreted in harmony with other portions of Scripture. That which is taught plainly, and without the use of symbols or hieroglyphics, will help to explain the more difficult portions in which symbolic pictures abound ; and the latter must not be so interpreted as to conflict with the former.

Guided by the foregoing propositions, we may learn the true meaning of the prophetic visions of John ; and, as I think, in no other way. And it is quite clear to my mind that the editor's theory is based upon an erroneous interpretation of some of the visions of John ; an interpretation not in harmony with the inspired interpretations of other prophetic visions recorded in the Bible ; and, in some respects, in direct conflict with the plain teaching of the Bible. To sustain that theory, it will be necessary, I think, to prove,

1. That there will be, on this earth, a period of "sinless and painless bliss."

2. That this period will be of precisely one thousand years' duration, properly a millennium.

3. That this is the same thousand years mentioned in the 20th of Revelation.

4. That immediately previous to, or at the very commencement of, this thousand years of "sinless and painless bliss," the second advent of Christ will occur.

5. That simultaneous with the commencement of this thousand years

and the advent of Christ, or at least immediately connected therewith, the wicked then living on the earth will be instantly killed.

6. That at the same time all the righteous dead will be raised.

7. That Satan, not the dragon, but literally and really Satan, will be bound with a chain and shut up in the great abyss.

8. That then follows the millennium the thousand years of "sinless and painless bliss," during which Christ will reign in person over his saints on earth.

9. That immediately after the expiration of the millennium, and before the great battle with the armies of Gog and Magog, the wicked dead will all be raised.

10. That then Satan, the real Satan, having been loosed from his prison and the great chain removed from him, will go forth again to deceive nations.

[*Query.*—Where will Christ and his saints be during that little season?]

11. That then will occur the great battle with Gog and Magog, in which they will be overthrown, and Satan will be cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and false prophet are.

[*Query.*—Who are they, and where and what is this lake?]

12. After all this the final judgment will take place.

Now, if there is any one of these propositions which can be clearly and definitely proved, by any fair and reasonable method of interpreting Scripture, I confess I do not know which one it is. To me it appears indubitably certain that they are each and all of them, not only wanting in proof, but that at least some of them are in direct conflict with clearly taught truths. I am anxious, however, to see what can be said in defense of the editor's theory. Will the editor take up the items of that theory, one by one, and let us know what scriptural proofs of their truth he has at command? Let us have done with mere theorizing on this subject. If the Bible teaches anything in relation to a millennium, let us try to find out what it is by means of the same careful exegesis of Scripture which we employ on other subjects. And let those who entertain theories in relation to it come forward with their proofs and arguments in vindication of them.

O.

THE FOREGOING.—O.'s article is laid with pleasure before the readers of the *Quarterly*. It is a gentlemanly, well-written piece. Whether true or not, the reader is left to form his own judgment. In the next number, time and health permitting, I hope to be able to notice so much of it as may need it. This, however, is promised only conditionally. It is not safe to write too elaborately on the millennium. Thought and leisure should here characterize all we say. I am in no hurry to "venture more."

UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

"WHAT has been may be again." "History repeats itself." If these statements are true, we have but to inquire what has been, in order to know, pretty certainly, what will be. What, then, has been or is the history of Church and State union? It is simply this: There has not been a State, nation, kingdom, or empire, since the apostacy took definite form in 325, of any considerable note, that has not joined in adulterous wedlock some church. Nor has there since that time ever been found an apostate church wanting in readiness to form the union. And so necessary is this union deemed to the welfare of the State, that it has grown into an aphorism: "No bishop no king."

The State is made up of men; and just as every man must have some religion, so must the State, which is composed of men.

But some will say, perhaps, that the United States will never adopt a State religion; that it opposes such a procedure in its organic law. It is thought that such a union is so fundamentally opposed to what our government is, as made by its wise and good founders, it could never be brought to do the deed. But I remember what others have done; that every other government has taken to its embrace and under its husbandly care some form of religion. Shall we be an exception? We have certainly gloried hitherto in being an exception; but shall we continue so? I fear not. Will you reply, that, though the government should desire a junction of Church and State, the people are not ready for it?

The people here are the government, or, at least, they make it; therefore, if the Government wishes the union, the people do. Nor will constitutional provisions stand in the way. The people make the constitution, and they can unmake it, as well. And they will do it, of course, when they wish. But is it probable that they will so decree? I reply: See what all other people have done, and you have the answer; at least, the one which reason must give and accept.

There is now a wide-spread organization, the object of which is to have an article of religion engrafted into the Constitution of the United States. They argue that we claim verbally to be a Christian nation, a Christian people, but that we have a Constitution which does not recognize the existence of God, a Savior, or the Holy Scriptures. This state of things, it is urged, must be changed; that the Constitution of "our nation" must speak out, in plain terms, the popular sentiment of our people. The organization mentioned has for its object, to have an article inserted in the Constitution of the United States,

and of the several States, recognizing the fact that we are a "Christian nation."

In this way, and by other means now at work, not very slowly, we shall be brought to take the first step ; to acknowledge, in our organic law, the necessity of our being nationally a Christian people. The remaining steps will be easy and natural, and will follow in quick succession. Of course, if we must have religion, or get religion nationally, we ought and must join some church, or have some church to join us. The sentiment is universal, I think, that if any one gets religion, it is his duty to join some church. If the government should get religion, why should it not do the same ?

But the reader may say that there is no church in this country so base as to be willing to do the thing. Indeed ! Remember "*tempora mutantur, mutamur in illis* ;" "times are changed, and we are changed in them." Churches in other countries, nearly all of which are largely represented here, have been willing even to the knife, and the knife to the hilt. Why should they not be here ? Upon what diet do we feed, that we should be an exception to all others ? Nearly all the churches in this country are willing, and they have ever been, to have men to legislate for them in religious matters ; the results we see in the form of human-made creeds. And though it should be claimed that the wisdom employed in making these symbols of faith is sanctified by grace divine, still it must be allowed that it is human, and therefore fallible. Now, it seems to me that the step from this to that of union with the State is not long or difficult. Besides, into many of the churches the world enters largely, not from accident or from causes unavoidable, but in accordance with their own deliberately made laws. I doubt whether, in the Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, and Episcopal churches, and some others, any more than half of their legitimate membership even claim to be Christians. Could not such churches be easily persuaded to the pious task of taking into their care and embrace the government ; especially if the plea should ever be urged, as it certainly will be, that some other hated and feared church power is likely and about to do so ? I will not say so ; but I remember the past, and fear. The mothers and grandmothers have married the State, and the daughters are, to my mind, the legitimate offspring of their adulterous ancestors.

The Baptist Church and the churches of Christ can hardly do such a thing. They have no authoritative organization that would enable them so to act ; and it is devoutly to be hoped that they never will have. There is more true wisdom in the scriptural fact, that the churches of Christ are individually independent of each other, except in so far as their sympathy and love for each other would induce them to act together, than has generally been supposed. The churches of Christ, or scriptural churches, can never form a denomination,

in the ordinary sense of the term, and hence they can never form a union with the State, such as we are contemplating. For the power of all the churches must be concentrated into some one head, as in that of the Pope ; or in some controlling council, synod, or conference, as that of Nice or Constantinople, ere it is possible for them to unite with the State. This, I trust, they will never attempt to do ; and it is certain that they would cease to be Christian churches at once if they did.

It may be objected that there are so many different denominations, that, should any one of them attempt such a thing as a union with the State, the others would all combine and defeat it. This has always been the strongest plea, in the minds of worldly-minded men, in favor of the existence of many separate and opposing sects. It has even been thought that, though condemned in the Scriptures, it is a condition of things brought to pass by God, in his providence. Each sect, it is supposed, compels the other to keep the peace, and prevents it from doing what it is, by necessary implication, charged it would do if left to itself. It will be seen at a glance that this plea is based upon the supposition, not very complimentary to the parties, that each one of "the sects" would, if it could, unite with the State ; and having secured the strong arm of power, would persecute all dissenters. This, I believe, most, if not every one, of the sects would in the end do. Let it, then, be admitted that the divided state of sectarianism is a blessing ; that were they united to an extent that would enable them to take charge of the government, and "run the machine" to their own liking, they would do it. Before, then, we can calculate reasonably upon an early effort at union of church and state in this country, we must see a reasonable prospect of a union of "sects," and that, too, to an extent sufficient to give the needed power. Do we see any indication of a union of "sects?" Notice, I do not speak of the union of Christians, but of those who call themselves, and glory in being called, sects. I raise no question as to their Christianity. I only allow that they are what they claim to be—"sects." When Christians, nominally and really, who claim to be and wish to be nothing more than simply Christians, unite with one another, good men rejoice ; for the union takes place in Christ Jesus and on the word of God alone, which allows no room for union with the State, nor for persecuting those who dissent from them. From such a union no one needs to fear, except the Devil, demons, and bad men. But, as said above, we are now speaking of the union "of sects," a title which is with them self-imposed. Is there a prospect of such a union ? I think there is.

Mark you, I do not say that they contemplate union with an unholy purpose before them. I simply ask : Do they labor with sect-union as their definite object, and with a well-matured plan before them by

which to reach it? Are they now so laboring? For ten years or more temporary union meetings for prayer, for preaching, for converting sinners, etc., have been frequent. For quite a number of years the question of union, not of Christians in one church, but of churches in one visible alliance, or "church union," has been before the public. More recently such a union has been effected. It is as yet in embryo, but there is seen

"The baby figures of the giant mass
Of things to come at large."

This, small beginning though it is, furnishes a nucleus around which the marshaling hosts will gather at the proper time. The bolder ones have already stepped out, and, like the patriot sires, pledged their all for the accomplishment of their purpose. They promise "to stand by each other." That means work, and perhaps more than merely moral conflict. The more timid wait and watch, and, like some insects of lesser type, push forward their tentacles of observation. As in the case of the mourner's bench and infant baptism, the question with too many is and will be: "Will it work well?"

This parent society has, I believe, several subordinate and co-ordinate branches. Now let a few shrewd wire-workers raise the cry that the Catholics are maturing arrangements for being adopted as the "national church," and in a trice the sects are one and on their way to Washington.

Not that any one of them would at all approve a union of church and State. By no means. But then, it will be urged, it is clear that some church will be selected as the national church, and it is better that we should be than that others should. Necessity will be pleaded; and necessity knows no law. Let the wheel but once be put in motion, and no power on earth can stop it.

L. B.

NOTE TO L. B.—Politicians may smile at the foregoing, as the dream of a preacher, and hence of one who does not understand the workings of the State. Perhaps the smile would not be groundless. Still we share in the fears of the preacher, and have but little respect for the smile. Mark well this, before our government is twice as old as it now is, Roman Catholics will make an effort to control it. Protestants will combine to defeat that effort. That struggle over, and the successful party and the State are in alliance. We look on this as so certain, that nothing but divine interposition can prevent it. Our faith in the stability of governments and the Christianity of so-called churches is gone.

THE TWO ASPECTS OF FAITH AS PRESENTED IN
HEBREWS XI, 1.

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." 1. Perhaps no passage of the Scriptures has become more familiar than the above, owing to the fact that it never fails to serve as the text whenever faith is the subject of discourse. With a view to showing what faith is, how it comes, and what are its fruits, both internal and external, this passage is analyzed, its different terms explained, which, when put together, form, we are told, the apostle's definition of faith. Ministers of the gospel who use the word definition in such a loose and empirical sense should have, we think, a more correct conception of the true idea and office of a definition. Definition, from the Latin *definitio*, meaning literally the tracing of limits, the running off and laying down a boundary, aims to determine a thing in its compass and extent, to point out the constituent parts of the essence of that which is to be defined ; so that, strictly speaking, nothing is susceptible of definition which does not admit of the process of analysis and synthesis, either physically or metaphysically, really or ideally. We have a physical definition when there is an enumeration of such parts as are actually separable, as the root, trunk, branches, and bark of a tree ; a metaphysical or logical definition when there is a statement, not of the real parts into which the thing defined can be actually separated, as in the former case, but of the different views taken, or notions formed, of a class of objects by the mind. When the geometrician defines a circle to be a curve lying in a plane surface, every point of which is equi-distant from a point within called the centre, this is what is termed a logical definition, and which is exhaustive, because every property and possibility of the circle are implied in such a statement. But when we leave the domain of the exact sciences, and advance up into the regions of the metaphysical and spiritual, we can not take with us our line and compass, our analysis and synthesis, for the purpose of tracing metes and bounds, and determining things in their full compass and extent. In this department of knowledge, we must be content with verbal description, which, passing by the essence of the thing, aims to present it in its accidents and circumstances, in its causes and effects, for the purpose of impressing by striking delineation. No philosopher or theologian undertakes to define love. Being a simple and not a complex mental state, like all the other simple mental acts and states, such as sensation, the notion of time and space, the æsthetic feeling, it

defies all our powers of analysis. So also faith, intimately associated with and working by love, like the soul itself in its mysterious movements, can not be presented as an object of thought under scientific formulas and verbal definitions. We may call faith the belief of testimony, conviction, trust, persuasion ; with John, we may call it "the victory that overcomes the world ;" or with Paul, "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen ;" but whatever be the ideas which we attach to those terms and phrases, we must regard them as descriptive, and not definitive, since their office is to present faith in its different aspects, and not to determine it in its full compass and extent. Hence we must accept the language of Hebrews xi., 1, as a description, and not as a definition, of faith. In this passage faith is presented in two aspects, expressed in Greek by the terms *hupostasis* and *elengchos*.

2. We would, then, proceed to ascertain what is meant by calling faith "the substance (*hupostasis*) of things hoped for." The term *hupostasis*, from *ὑπό*, under, and *στημι*, to stand, and hence meaning, primarily, a basis or foundation which serves as a support to something else, occurs in New Testament Greek just five times, being found in the following places : 2 Cor. ix., 4, and xi., 17 ; Heb. i., 3, iii., 14, and xi., 1. The first occurrence of this word (2 Cor. ix., 4), in which we have the phrase *τῇ ὑποστάσει ταυτῇ τῆς καυχώσεως*, is rendered by the king's translators, by Macknight, and by Anderson, adjectively, giving us the phrase "this confident boasting." The precise meaning of the term in this place will emerge by a little attention to the context. The apostle, in order to incite the Macedonian Christians to assist in extending relief to the poor saints in Judæa, had boasted to them of the readiness of mind displayed in this matter by the Corinthians, and now in his epistle he exhorts them to complete this work of benevolence, lest when he made them his contemplated visit, and finding them unprepared, he should be put to shame by this *hupostasis*, ground of boasting, i. e., by this foundation upon which he had based his appeal to the Macedonians, and which was the known liberality of the Corinthian church. Neither can this word, in its second occurrence (2 Cor. xi., 17), be correctly rendered confidence. The false teacher sought to ingratiate himself with the Corinthian Christians by his boasting. The apostle, in order to show his folly, meets him on his own ground, saying that he also will indulge in self-laudation, but yet speaking as in folly while standing on this ground of boasting. Hence *hupostasis*, in this place, will be correctly rendered thus : "What I speak, I speak not according to the Lord, but as in folly while on this ground of boasting." The next occurrence of this word (Heb. i., 3), where we have the phrase : "The express image of his *hupostasis*," is rendered by the king's translators "person ;" by Macknight and the Bible Union, "substance ;" by Anderson, "essence." As

to person, *hupostasis* was never used in this sense till after the Arian controversy on the divinity of Christ ; and although substance is applied to things either physical or metaphysical, yet when applied to God, who is spirit, sounds, we think, too materialistic ; while the word essence belongs to a sphere of thought which, to the great mass of Bible readers, is a *terra incognita*. Here, we think, this term would be correctly rendered by our word "being," since Christ is affirmed to be, not only the effulgence of God's glory, the medium through which all the divine perfections shone out in full perfection, but, being originally in the form of God, all the divine attributes exist in him in the very mode in which they exist in the Father. He showed what God is when incarnate, living in his human nature as God lives in heaven, so that he was the exact representation of his being. Even here the etymological meaning of *hupostasis* is quite perceptible, since it signifies not the attributes of God, but his self-existent being, which is the embodiment of the divine perfections, and by which they are manifested to his intelligent creatures. That the fourth occurrence of *hupostasis* (Heb. iii., 14) conveys the simple idea of a foundation and not of confidence is clear from the previous context, in which Christians are called the house of Christ, built as living stones upon a common foundation. True, this foundation may be, in this case, confidence in Christ, yet to translate *hupostasis* here by confidence destroys the image of a building and the association of ideas connected therewith. The passage, then, should be rendered thus : "For we are partakers of the Christ, if indeed we hold fast the beginning of our foundation firm to the end."

Having seen that *hupostasis* in none of its occurrences yet examined can be properly translated confidence, we now come to the last use of this word in New Testament Greek, and ask whether confidence, or any other word of kindred signification, can stand as its proper representative. The laws of thought which preside over language determine what relation one word may be made to sustain to another. Thus, we place confidence or repose trust in a person, in his integrity, stability, or veracity, also in the truth and reality of a fact ; but never confidence, trust, or assurance of either a person or a thing. We may illustrate by *pepoitheesis*, the proper word for confidence in New Testament Greek. As this word, from its signification, can not govern the objective or causative genitive, we find, in every place where it occurs under circumstances suitable for testing this principle, that it is followed by a preposition, as in 2 Cor. iii., 4, "(*pepoitheesis*) confidence (*pros*) toward God ;" in viii., 22, of the same epistle, "(*pepoitheesis*) confidence (*eis*) in you ;" in Phil. iii., 4, "(*pepoitheesis*) confidence (*en*) in the flesh." But in Heb. xi., 1, *hupostasis* governs the objective genitive in the phrase : *elpidzomenoon* "of things hoped for," so that it is clear, on a moment's reflection, that the

idea of confidence, trust, or assurance, is wholly foreign to the word also in this place. We can not speak correct English and say that faith is confidence of, or "with respect to," things hoped for, but that it is confidence in the truth of facts or testimony, that it is trust in a person. Hence those who translate *hupostasis* in Heb. xi., 1, by confidence, or any other word of kindred signification, entirely lose sight of the point of view from which faith, in this particular passage, is contemplated. Faith, as we have seen, can not be defined, but may be described. But as to what particular epithets we apply to faith depends altogether on our point of view, on the train of thought in the mind. When viewed with reference to a person, to Christ, in whom the soul passively rests with the fullness of assurance, faith then properly takes the name of confidence; when viewed with reference to testimony which vanquishes and expels from the mind every doubt and impels to belief, it takes the name of conviction, or persuasion; or again, when viewed as a living energy in the soul, a divine out-working, we may with John, by an expressive metonymy, call it "the victory that overcomes the world." But when faith in Heb. xi., 1, is called "*hupostasis* of things hoped for," it is viewed solely with reference to the future; not, however, for the purpose of showing its relation to hope, or, in other words, that faith is the subjective ground of hope, for the phrase "hoped for" is nothing more than a qualifying epithet, serving to point out and define the things of faith,—first, by locating them in the future; second, by showing that the things as thus located are only those embraced in the divine promises, and which awaken in us desire and expectation. When the future is rendered bright and attractive by hope, what is the nature of that relation which faith sustains to it? This relation is expressed in the original by *hupostasis*, and most forcibly illustrated in the 12th chapter of Hebrews, in the following language: "You have come to Mount Zion, and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to myriads of angels; to the general assembly and church of the first-born, who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than the blood of Abel!" How have Christians come to the heavenly Jerusalem, and all those other glorious things of the future world here so gorgeously described, and which, as beheld in the apocalyptic vision, are not to be realized till the end of time? It can only be said that they have come to a realization of the things of the eternal world by faith, which sees the future as the present, which looks above and beyond this mundane sphere, and which, embracing the things that are afar off, "brings eternal glories nigh," causing them to become in the mind of the believer a present reality, a present possession and enjoyment. Faith, annihilating as it were the long

and dreary ages which intervene between the Christian and the actual possession and enjoyment of the things hoped for, carries the soul away from earth and from the present, and causes the believer to live even while on earth in the future, the spiritual and eternal. Were it not for faith, the future pictured to the mind by hope in a halo of heavenly light would be a blank of empty and impalpable darkness, and the things hoped for would have for us no existence, no reality, consequently could exert over us no influence. Of all the things hoped for, nothing so forcibly illustrates the realizing power of faith as the resurrection, that bright "manifestation of the sons of God," in which corruption shall put on incorruption, mortality assume immortality, and death shall be "swallowed up in victory."

I visit the old family burial-place, where lies the slumbering dust of those whose names are traced upon the marble slab. Forms that once moved as visions of light and beauty have turned to lifeless clay, and, covered with the blight and mildew of death, lie mouldering here in the darkness of the grave; eyes that once shown with heaven's ethereal fires have become dim and sightless; cheeks that once glowed with the rose-bloom of health have here, in those sunless chambers, assumed the bloodless hue that belongs to the land of shade; hearts that once, as living lyres, thrilled with sweetest melody, lie here silent and unstrung. Such a scene, with such associations, viewed in the light of the present or through the revelations of sense, is a cheerless and hopeless one indeed. It is a Golgotha, where the bones of the dead are promiscuously heaped together; the "valley of tears," which leads down into unknown regions of darkness beyond. By the feeble light of reason, which only makes visible the brooding darkness, I can detect no germ of life in the silent dust which moulders beneath my feet. By the harmony and uniformity of nature's laws, I know that though the grass may wither, and those flowers planted here by the hand of affection may fade, yet returning spring will awake to life the flowers, and clothe again the earth in a robe of green; but sense tells me of no spring which shall "ever visit the mouldering urn," or day which shall "ever dawn on the night of the grave. The gloomy cypress waving to the passing breeze, and the pale marble carved with sculptured device, are to the eye of sense only the sad memorials of broken households and bereaved and grief-stricken hearts. But I call to my side Faith, the "angel of life," and ask her if this lifeless clay shall ever bloom again; and pointing to the future, she waves her magic wand over this valley of death, and lo! it becomes enchanted ground, and, like the sudden wheeling of the earth from out the darkness of midnight into the brightness of noonday, this dreary scene is in a moment changed into one of enrapturing beauty. The Prince of Life returns from heaven to ransom his people from the

power of the grave ; he unbars the portals of the tomb ; the trumpet sounds, and "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," the sleeping dead, arrayed in the garments of immortality, spring forth, "to meet the Lord in the air." This bright vision of life and immortality, which, like the rainbow of promise gilding the cloud, lights up the future and fills the soul with "joy unspeakable and full of glory," is the creation of faith, which gives the things hoped for a present reality in the mind of the believer.

Now, this relation of faith to the future, giving it the reality, vividness, and power of the present, is described in Greek by the word *hupostasis*. To understand the full import of this term, as here used, we must not lose sight of its etymological meaning. Just as the superstructure rests upon its foundation, depending on it for its existence, so the things embraced in the divine promises, being received into the mind and appropriated by faith, rest upon it as a mental basis, and exist for us by means of it. Hence, the Christian's faith is mightier than Atlas of old, who is fabled to have supported the heavens upon his shoulders ; for it upholds in the mind of the believer both the "new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." Then, keeping before us the literal meaning of *hupostasis*, by what term or phrase can it be properly represented in English, as used in Heb. xi., 1, to describe the relation of faith to the future ? The Common Version endeavors to do this by the word "substance." This term labors under the disadvantage of suggesting to the unmetaphysical merely that which is real, as opposed to that which is shadowy and unreal. Substance, in the sense of essence, is that which exists in and by itself, while the inherence of properties in the essence is called subsistence. Now, as matter gives a subsistence to the properties which inhere in it, so faith, viewed in its relation to the future as a realizing power, gives a subsistence to the objects of hope ; and as this relation is of a metaphysical nature, we may call it the mental subsistence ; so that "faith is the mental subsistence of things hoped for." By what we have said for the purpose of explaining the relation of faith to the future, when we give *hupostasis* the above rendering, we will be understood as meaning the realizing and appropriating power of faith, by which the things hoped for are received into the mind and become food for the soul, the soul subsisting upon them, and becoming more and more energized with a divine life. While we are fully satisfied that the idea which the above rendering aims to express is true to the original, we freely admit that the rendering itself is not altogether unexposed to objections, as, perhaps, no effort to do full justice to *hupostasis* in this passage can be.

But faith is not only related to the future, but also to the unseen, to what lies beyond the circle of personal experience, in which case

the matters of faith, or the things to be believed, assume the form not of simple promises, as when faith points to the future, but of divine declarations, which may belong, not to the past alone, but to either the past, the present, or the future, to all things which, as matters of divine revelation, lie beyond the horizon of sense. Faith, viewed in its relation to the future, gives a reality to the promises of God ; but when contemplated with reference to the unseen, it lifts the veil of sense, and gazes in upon the glory-encircled throne of God himself. This important aspect of faith is expressed in the second clause of the passage at the head of this essay, by the term *elengchos*.

3. What, then, is meant by calling faith "*elengchos* (the evidence) of things not seen?" This word occurs only twice in New Testament Greek, being found in 2 Tim. iii., 16, and here in the passage before us. Coming from the verb *ελεγχω*, to convince, to demonstrate, to make manifest and show to be true ; it means primarily, conviction, a demonstration, or that by means of which anything before unknown becomes manifest and known. In 2 Tim. iii., 16, the correct rendering would be conviction, because this term is there used with reference to the Scriptures, which, in religious matters, are the divinely appointed means of refuting those who oppose the truth and convincing of error. Here, in Heb. xi., 1, the Common Version gives us "evidence ;" the Bible Union, "conviction ;" Anderson, "persuasion." We think those modern translators, in endeavoring to improve the rendering of the Common Version, have entirely lost sight of the particular aspect of faith which the term *elengchos* in this place is designed to express. Conviction, from *con*, intensive, and *vinco*, to conquer, subdue, properly describes faith when viewed with reference to testimony which subdues and expels from the mind all doubt, and produces a feeling of certitude with regard to any fact or proposition. Persuasion in signification is kindred with conviction, but not synonymous with it. The mind is said to be convinced when all doubt is removed with regard to any fact or proposition ; whereas, persuasion has reference to a person or a living agent who, not only aims to free the mind from all doubt, but who also aims to incite to action by moving the passions and determining the will. But here, in Heb. xi., 1, faith is viewed neither with reference to testimony simply, nor again with reference to moving the passions and inciting to action ; but in its relation to the unseen, as making things, which to the eye of sense are invisible, visible realities to the soul. The nature of this relation will more fully emerge by ascertaining what is meant by the phrase, "things not seen." Things unseen are distinguished from "things hoped for," in that the latter means the things embraced in the divine promises only ; whereas, the former has a more extended application, embracing all those things which as matters of divine revelation lie beyond the circle of personal experience, such as the creation of the

world out of nothing, with all the other supernatural facts of Old Testament history ; also the great facts of human redemption, such as the conception, birth, life, death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and coronation of the Messiah. Under this head is also included the invisible spiritual world, in which live and move myriads of angels, where God, whom no man has seen, dwells in glory, and where the Christian's King reigns in light unapproachable. Hence, "things not seen" stand opposed to the things seen, or to the sensuous, and which, because they are beyond and above the sphere of sense, we call the supersensuous. How do we obtain a knowledge of things seen, of the sensuous, or know that there is an external material world ? It is by our five senses, the medium between the mind and the physical world. How do we obtain a knowledge of things not seen, or know that there is a spiritual universe above and beyond our mundane sphere, yet, like the circumambient atmosphere, surrounding and impinging closely upon it ? It is by faith, which, lifting the soul above the sensuous, serves as the medium between it and the supersensuous. Hence, in religious matters, which have reference to the unseen and spiritual, we walk by faith, looking "not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are not seen ; for the things seen are temporal, but the things not seen are eternal." Then there are two systems—the one natural and physical, the other supernatural and spiritual, which, supplementing each other, form one complete cosmos ; like man, who, by his twofold nature, is allied to both those systems, yet in the union of soul and body constitutes but one personality. Moreover, as sense implies the sensuous, as one is the correlate of the other, so the spiritual in man, or the faculty of faith, which finds its appropriate sphere only in a higher spiritual, implies the supersensuous. As the eye is for seeing, and implies that there are visible forms in nature to be seen, as the ear is for hearing, and implies that there are sounds to be heard, so faith, being a receptivity for the unseen and the divine, implies that there is a supernatural and spiritual world, the appropriate sphere and home of faith :

"Where nothing earthly bounds her flight,
Nor shadow dims her way."

As the needle points to the pole, as the flower turns to the sun, so does the soul, with its "high instincts," with its deep susceptibilities to reverence, gratitude, and love, with its restless cravings, which no earthly good can satisfy, when not utterly besotted and brutalized by sin, seek communion in some form with this higher, purer, and better world.

Now, since faith sustains the same relation to the unseen and spiritual that sight or sense does to the seen or the sensuous, the same term that will express the nature of one of those relations will

also express the other. The term which the apostle has chosen to express this relation in Greek is, as we have seen, *elengchos*, rendered in the Common Version "evidence," giving us the phrase, "the evidence of things not seen." Evidence, we think, is our most appropriate term by which to translate *elengchos* in this place, and to express the relation of faith to the unseen. The effort to supplant this word by "conviction" or "persuasion," originates, we think, from a mistake as to its true meaning ; a mistake consisting in the fact that it is confounded with testimony. Testimony, from *testis*, a witness, properly applies to the declaration or affirmation of a person under oath, and is hence more frequently used than otherwise in judicial proceedings ; whereas, evidence, from *ex*, from, and *video*, to see, and hence meaning primarily, that by which something is made visible to the mind, is the effect of testimony on the soul. Hence, evidence may arise either from our own perception of the senses, from the testimony of others, or from inductions of reason. By sight, or sense, I perceive that there exists something out of and independently of myself ; I form a notion of matter, with its different qualities, forces, and phenomena ; so that, calling the cause by the name of the effect, sense is to me the evidence of things seen, of a visible material world. Again : twelve men, whose testimony is every way worthy of the fullest credence, testify to the fact of Christ's resurrection, which testimony, being received into my mind, produces faith in a risen Lord. This faith, when viewed with reference to the testimony that produced it, takes the name of conviction, but when viewed with reference to the unseen fact of a Savior's resurrection, being that faculty of the soul by which things beyond the circle of personal experience, beyond and above the sphere of sense, are made visible to the mind, it is properly called evidence. In the sphere of the sensuous we have sight, light, and things seen ; in that of the supersensuous we have faith, testimony or spiritual light, and the things believed. As sight is the evidence of the seen, so faith is the evidence of the unseen. Hence, faith, as the mental subsistence of things hoped for, not only brings the future into the present, but as the evidence of things not seen, as the vision of the soul, also makes visible the invisible, giving both the past, the future, and the unseen a present reality and power over the mind.

Such being the relation of faith to the future and the unseen, could we find so strange an anomaly as a man entirely without faith of any kind we would see one having neither past nor future, one living only in the present, and believing only in the seen ; and as thus shut in and circumscribed, his soul, enveloped in darkness, would ever remain in a dwarfed and undeveloped state. As colors to the blind, as sounds to the deaf, so to such a one would be all the rich lessons and legacies of the past, and all the soul-enrapturing visions of the hope-gilded future, all the grand realities of the invisible spiritual world.

Hence, the voice of history, both sacred and profane, proclaims the truth, that the greatest heroes of earth, the giants whose mighty footsteps re-echo along the corridors of time, have been men of strong and living faith in the future and the unseen, in the supernatural and divine; "men who, through faith, subdued kingdoms, worked righteousness, obtained promises, closed the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, became valiant in battle, turned to flight the armies of the aliens." After the description of faith given in the first verse all the remainder of the 11th chapter of Hebrews is a kind of a running commentary on this passage, consisting of examples taken from the Old Testament history, all of which illustrate faith either in its relation to the future or the unseen.

L.

L's ARTICLE.—In a former number of the *Quarterly* we called for an essay on the apostle's definition of *faith*, as found in Hebrews xi., 1. In the preceding we have L's response to that call. That it is a very creditable effort, evincing much thought on the matter to which it relates, no one who gives it a careful reading will deny. Whether L's conclusions are to be accepted as completely decisive, and therefore final, is a point here merely suggested, but on which for the present I shall deliver no opinion. In the third number of the *Quarterly*, the Lord willing, I hope to be able to speak a word on the question in issue, when both this and all other points, whether of agreement or difference, will be brought up for consideration. L. objects to calling the apostle's statement a definition, and prefers to designate it by the word description. In this, at least, he has shown his independence and readiness to think for himself, but whether the result is a gain or not, I believe, may be profitably reconsidered. Nor is this to be construed otherwise than as a mere suggestion. On all these issues let us have free, vigorous, manful thought, and responses sharp, respectful, and thoroughly sifting, then may we hope to see the truth come out. Again: in his article may not L. have allowed himself to be led into a discussion metaphysical to a degree, not required by the question in hand? Is not a simpler view, one falling nearer the line of every-day life, more likely, *a priori*, to be the true one? Faith is something which has, for the Christian man at least, a very appreciable existence. It is near him, easy to him and natural; and therefore, is most likely to seem to him simple and easy of comprehension. It is not likely to appear to him complex and difficult. Such I believe most persons feel it to be. If so, it would hardly bear to be even so much as tinged with metaphysics. But this again only in the way of suggestion.

WAR.

WAR ! *Bellum ! Polemos ! Milchamah !* How awful thy ravages ! How desolating thy dark and gloomy progress ! What bright prospects hast thou blighted ! What fond hopes hast thou forever withered ! What innumerable hearts hast thou made to bleed in bitter anguish ! Oh ! insatiable, cruel Mars, how red thine altars ! How gory thy sacrifices ! How long and dark and horrifying the train of evils that follow thy victorious chariot ! War is the history of our fallen race. It has been written upon a blotted page, with a pen dipped in blood, alleviated by the wailings of the widow, the tears and sighs of the orphan. The pale, emaciated, sallow-faced sufferer, sorrow painted upon the countenance, melancholy brooding over the eye, the body half covered with torn and tattered garments, the smoky hovels of poverty and want, pestilence, famine, wretchedness stalking throughout the length and breadth of the land,—these are some of the infernal fruits of the desolations of war. People of the living God, followers of the Prince of peace, how long ere ye will not cease to worship at the reeking, smoking shrine of the god of war ? How long will ye lend your influence to countenance, to bolster up, the dark and bloody system of the insatiable monster ?

Query.—What is war ? Answer.—That science by which men are trained, in the most successful manner, to manufacture widows and orphans by the wholesale,—to scatter misery in every form and shape broadcast over the field of humanity,—to multiply crime and vice of every form, of every shape, of every kind. Oh ! how strange that any Christian man should require an argument to convince him that he should have no participation in war, no fellowship with it, but wash his hands clean altogether of it. The only war in which the Christian should engage is the war against the world, the flesh, the Devil, and the powers of darkness ; let him concentrate all his energies here, leaving the potsherd of the earth to strive with the potsherd. But, says the advocate of the dark and bloody science, Abraham countenanced war, had three hundred and eighteen trained soldiers born in his house, pursued the conquerors of the king of Sodom, made a flank movement upon them, attacked them, gained a splendid victory, retook Lot, and brought away rich spoils from the enemy. Granted. And this same mighty warrior, in addition to his wife Sarah, had as a concubine Hagar, the Egyptian bondmaid ; *ergo*, the Christian man has a right, in addition to his legally constituted Christian wife, to take an Egyptian bondmaid as a concubine. The latter conclusion is every whit and grain as legitimate as to infer from Abraham's military ex-

pedition to recover Lot that the Christian man has a right to engage in the bloody strife of war.

But did not the God of Israel authorize, countenance, and command war? Did he not require the Israelites to exterminate the nations of Canaan? And was not one of the causes for dethroning Saul and establishing David in his place, because he failed wholly to exterminate the Amalekites? Most assuredly, we answer to all these questions. And what does this prove;—that the Christian has the right, upon human authority, to enter upon a wholesale butchery of the human race? No; by no means. Just as consistently might he attempt to open the windows of heaven, break up the fountains of the great deep, and bring another deluge of water upon the earth for the destruction of its inhabitants. The people had become ripe for destruction in both these cases. There had not been left a sufficiency of the salt of true religion, virtue, and morality to preserve the putrid masses. God determined to destroy them; in one case by a deluge of waters, the other by the armies of Israel, to whom the inheritance of these idolatrous Canaanites had been promised; and man had just as well claim, for justifying the exercise of his unhallowed passions, the examples of the great Deity in opening the mouth of the volcano, pouring out the rivers of lava, destroying towns, hamlets, villages, and cities, burying thousands beneath its fiery course,—or sending the hurricane, earthquake, thunderbolt, carrying destruction in their course,—as to reason, because Jehovah made a war of extermination upon the Canaanites, that therefore the Christian may engage in the wars of the world with impunity.

But, says the bloody apologist again: What answer did John the Baptist give to the soldiers who asked him what should they do. He said: "Do violence to no one, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages." (Luke iii., 14.)

In regard to this answer of John, we state, in the first place, that John was not in the kingdom of Christ, not under his reign; and while among those born of woman a greater had not arisen than John the Baptist, yet the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. (Matt. xi., 11.) And, besides, we think it would be rather a difficult task to reconcile the expression, "Do violence (*diaseisete*) to no man," with throwing bomb-shells, raining cannon-balls, hailing minnie-balls, and putting all other infernal agencies in operation for the wholesale destruction of man. The spectacle of hundreds and thousands of the mangled, mutilated, and torn bodies of the dead, the wounded, and the dying, upon the gory fields of carnage, is anything else than abstaining from "doing violence to no man." If this be the negative, then Heaven deliver us from the positive. The very spirit of war, diabolical as it is, is to perpetrate violence, and this in all wars, whether offensive or defensive. It is to overcome the opposing

foe, which can only be done by violence. Why, then, seek to press into service, to support this devilish system of violence and destruction, a text which directly in the teeth of it says, "Do violence to no man?" Truly such advocates must be hard pressed for testimony.

How stand the teaching and the example of Christ in regard to this matter? Go, place yourself among the disciples that sat at his feet, as the heavenly doctrine distilled from his lips, as he spoke upon the heights of Tabor. "Ye have heard that it hath been said: An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you: That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. Ye have heard that it hath been said: Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you: Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be the children of your Father who is in heaven, for he maketh his sun to rise upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them who love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the publicans so? Be ye, therefore, perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." (Matt. v., 38-48.)

Such is the testimony of the Prince of peace on this subject, upon whose advent into this world the joyful anthem was raised by the angelic choir, from the plains of Bethlehem, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will among men." (Luke ii., 14.) And in the accomplishment of the benevolent ends of whose divine reign the last gory sword, no longer bathed in human blood, is to be converted into the peaceful plowshare, the spear into the pruning-hook, and men shall study war no more." (Isaiah ii., 4.)

Luke ix., 51. On a certain occasion, when Christ was on his way to Jerusalem, he came to a certain village of the Samaritans, they refused to receive and entertain him. James and John, Sons of Thunder, being indignant, and feeling the war spirit move within them, said: "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did?" What said the great Shiloh, the Peace-maker, the Prince of peace? "But he turned and rebuked them, and said: Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them. And they went to another village." And were he here now, he would feel himself called upon to administer a similar rebuke to many sons of thunder now found in the Christian ranks. "You know not what manner of spirit ye are of; the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them;" and Paul would add: "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." That spirit is a spirit of peace. The spirit of war is the spirit of the world, the spirit of the Devil.

Matt. xxvi., 51, 52.—On the memorable night of the betrayal of Christ, “one of them who were with Jesus stretched out his hand and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high-priest, and smote off his ear.” What was the command of the Messiah on the occasion? “Then said Jesus unto him : Put up again thy sword into its place ; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” Nor can the advocates of this bloody weapon show when he ever afterward commanded it to be unsheathed, in order to be baptized in blood.

John xviii., 36.—Before Pilate he testified : “ My kingdom is not of this world ; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews ; but now is my kingdom not from hence.”

Without justly incurring the charge of “ special pleading,” we affirm that the force of this testimony is : If his kingdom were of this world, his servants, under such an organization, might fight ; but because his kingdom is not of this world ; governed by different principles from those that pervade the institutions of earth, that therefore it is not permitted to those who are subjects of that kingdom to engage in deadly strife. The Son of man came not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them. Put up thy sword into its scabbard : no more unsheath it ; for they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. If my kingdom were of the world, then my servants would fight, that I might not be delivered to the Jews ; but now my kingdom is not of this world, therefore they can not fight. All of which, we remark, is worthy of the Prince of peace. Oh ! that all his subjects might drink deep into the same spirit !

The Commissions.—The various forms of the commission given by Christ to the apostles for the conversion of the world show what was to be the great work of Christianity, both in its propagation and reception. The apologists for war need to be reminded of the character of this work. “ Go, preach the gospel,” said he ; “ Go, teach the nations ;” “ Repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all the nations ;” “ He breathed upon them, and said : Receive ye the Holy Spirit.” (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John.)

In accordance with the spirit of the commission, so was the work of the primitive Christians. They sought, through the instrumentality of the gospel of the grace of God, to convert a wicked and rebellious world from the ways of sin and death to the ways of the living God ; to destroy the hellish principles of hatred, variance, wrath, enmity, strife, in the hearts of men, and in their stead, incorporate the divine principle of love ; to fit and prepare them for the society of God, his Son, and the holy angels. How different from the unholy principle of a worldly ambition, leading professing Christians to engage in the bloody contests and strifes of earth ! How would the military titles

of Gen. Peter, Col. John, Maj. James, Capt. Philip, Lieut. Stephen, have accorded with the work in which these holy men were engaged ? To state the proposition is sufficient to show its entire absurdity. And yet the Christians of that day had identically the same right to covet military honors, wear military titles, engage in military strife, as the Christians of this or any other age. The whole system is wholly incompatible with the Christian profession, the Christian character, the design of the gospel ; it is one of the unhallowed fruits of the unhallowed connection between church and state, from which the Christian should wholly abstain.

Cornelius, Acts x.—But, says one, was not Cornelius a devout man ; one that feared God with all his house ; gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always ? Yes, most assuredly. And was he not a “centurion of the band, called the Italian band ?” Yes. And don’t that prove that a Christian may engage in war ? No ; by no means. In order to this, it would have to be shown, first, that this band, commanded by Cornelius, was engaged in actual warfare, and not simply in police duty ; whereas the condition and history of the Roman world at that time show the latter, and not the former, to be the case ; secondly, that he was a Christian while exercising the duties of this office, prior to sending for Peter, which also is contrary to the facts in the case. He was a religious man, praying and almsgiving, like many other military characters of this and preceding ages ; but it takes more than these qualities to constitute a Christian. But did he not become a Christian ? Yes. Well, does not that prove that a Christian may be a warrior ? No. For it would be necessary, in order to this, not only to prove that Cornelius was actually engaged in the active duties of warfare before he became a Christian, but that he continued to hold this position and to exercise these duties after becoming a Christian ; and though the former of these propositions might be established, yet the latter never can, there being no testimony on that point. Nor is there anything in the discourse of the Apostle Peter, by which he was converted, to justify the principle of warfare ; on the contrary, it testifies against it ; for says he : “The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace,” not war, “by Jesus Christ, he is Lord of all.” (x., 36.) Prince of peace ; he is to be obeyed ; his command is : “Put up the sword into its sheath ;” his declaration is : “If my kingdom were of this world, then might my servants fight ; but my kingdom is not of this world ;” therefore they can not fight ; his mission was, “not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

The Epistles.—We shall find as little to justify this worldly war-spirit in the epistles, written by the apostles to the churches. As a sample, take Paul to the Romans (xii., 19) : “Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath ; for it is written :

Vengeance is mine ; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger," not shoot him, "feed him ; if he thirst," not sabre him, "give him drink ; for in so doing, thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

But does not the same apostle say (xiii.) : "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God ; the powers that be are ordained of God ; whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God ; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation ?" Now when those "powers that be" command a Christian to take arms, and he refuses to do so, does he not violate the injunction which says, "be subject to the higher powers ;" and does he not "resist the ordinance of God ;" and does he not thereby bring himself under the denunciation of "receiving to himself damnation ?" Suppose these same "powers" should require the Christian to burn incense to and fall down and worship some deity of earth, would he not, by the same injunction, be required to do it ? And in refusing to do so, would he not be resisting an "ordinance of God ;" and in so doing bring upon himself the denunciation of "receiving to himself damnation ?" Oh, no. And why ? Because in the latter case he would be violating the law of God. And so we argue in regard to the former. As good citizens, we are bound to obey all the laws of the State which do not come in conflict with the law of Christ. But when we are required to perform any duty that comes in conflict with our allegiance to Christ, we are firmly and positively to refuse to do it, cost what it may ; as to take arms and engage in the deadly strife of war is manifestly contrary to the spirit and letter of Christianity, as already shown, the Christian is absolutely and divinely prohibited from engaging therein, and must refuse so to do, even at the expense of all that he has,—property, liberty, and even life itself.

1 Cor. xiii. *Agape*.—Our next argument against Christians engaging in war shall be based on Paul's dissertation on *agape*, charity, love, found 1 Cor. xiii. He there teaches us that without this love all profession of and pretension to Christianity is of no avail whatever. "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal ; and though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge ; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing !"

Now we aver that, from the definition which Paul gives of this charity, without which, in his estimation, everything else in religion is nothing, no man can, at the same time, be under the influence of this principle and breathe the spirit of war. They stand directly

antagonistic the one to the other. Take a constituent or so of this divine principle, as here delineated by the hand of inspiration : "Charity suffereth long, and is kind." That does not much resemble plotting death and destruction against the human race with the infernal engines of warfare. "Charity beareth all things ; endureth all things. ; never faileth."

This principle is to be exercised, not only to friend, but also to foe. "Ye have heard that it hath been said : Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy ; but I say unto you : Love your enemy ;" exercise toward them that principle which "suffereth long and is kind ; beareth all things, endureth all things, and never faileth." Again we repeat, and candor is bound to acknowledge it, that before the war spirit can enter, charity must first depart.

Rom. viii., 1 ; Gal. v., 19. *Flesh and Spirit*.—The great distinction between the sinner and the Christian is, the former walks according to the flesh, the latter according to the Spirit. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus who walk not after," or according to, "the flesh, but according to the Spirit." (Rom. viii., 1.) Now to determine whether a man walks "according to the flesh," or "according to the Spirit," we must examine the fruits of these respective opposite principles, and judge his life thereby. We have a summary of the fruits of the flesh and Spirit respectively delineated in Gal. v., 19. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders (*phonoi*), which is the very quintessence of war ; yes, *phonos*, a killing, slaughter, murder, is one of the chief ends and results of war, and correctly placed by Paul under the head of "the works of the flesh," "of the which things I tell you before," continues he, "as I have also told you in times past, that they who do such things,"—and among them, *phonoi*, killing, slaughter, murder,—"they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God ! But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace," not war, "long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance ; against such things there is no law." When a man, then, imbibes the bloody, cruel spirit of war, and acts according to its demoniacal behests, he discards the dominion of the Spirit and places himself under that of the flesh, and thereby forfeits his claims to the rights of the kingdom of the Prince of peace.

Soldier.—But is not the Christian represented in the apostolic writings as a soldier ? Yes ; and his enemies, his work, his armor, offensive and defensive, are all described. "Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against prin-

cialties, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness, and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," not war; "above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one; and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit." (Eph. vi., 10-17.) "The sword of the Spirit," no other sword; the metallic sword, effecting (*phonous*) killing, slaughter, death, murder, is to be put into its sheath so far as the Christian is concerned, as one of the instruments of the flesh; "for though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh; for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." (2 Cor. x., 3-5.) Therefore, the offensive weapon, and the only offensive weapon, which the soldier of Christ is authorized to take is "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God." Cannon, artillery, musketry, metallic swords and sabres, being instruments of the flesh, and belonging to the Devil, with these he has nothing to do; their object is the destruction of human life; but the Christian soldier is to have the Spirit of his divine Captain, who came, "not to destroy men's lives, but to save them;" "Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." (1 Tim. vi., 12.) "I have fought a good fight, finished the course, kept the faith; and henceforth there is a crown of righteousness laid up for me above which the Lord the righteous Judge will give me at that day, and not to me only, but to all those who love his appearing." (2 Tim. iv., 7.) This is the glorious struggle in which we are engaged, as the soldiers of the cross of Christ; and if, by the grace of God, we are faithful, we shall receive a crown of life which shall never fade; though we fall upon the field of battle, if found clothed in the panoply of heaven nobly facing the foe, we shall be raised to the enjoyment of eternal life.

Apocalypse.—But are not wars, military struggles, spoken of in the Apocalypse and other places in the divine record, and apparently with the permission, if not the approbation, of the great Ruler of the universe? We answer in the affirmative. Wars resemble thunderstorms, both in their objects and their results; and are frequently, especially in the Apocalypse, represented by them. The civil as well as the ecclesiastical heavens become surcharged with impurities, which, in order to a healthy state, require to be cleansed with the thunders and lightnings and earthquakes of war. Wickedness and corruption here work out their own legitimate fruits of carnage,

destruction, and death. But by what weapons? The weapons of the wicked themselves. The Christian is a law and order abiding citizen. The wars of earth are brought about by the ambition and misrule and violence of the people of the world; if, by the wickedness of their course they involve themselves in the evils of war, why, let them fight it out; let them abide the storms which their own wicked deeds have created; but let the Christian do all he can, by suppressing crime, by bringing the world under the influence of love, to prevent the recurrence of these storms; but when they arise let him have no participation in them; abide under the wings of the Almighty; dwell in his secret chambers until they be overpassed, at the same time ministering all in his power, spiritually and temporally, to the wants of the unfortunate victims.

But is there never to be a period when the Christian soldier shall turn his weapons of love into those of wrath? Yes. When? When his great Leader shall lay aside the nature of the lamb and assume that of the lion; when he shall be "revealed from heaven in flaming fire, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. i., 8.) "Let the saints be joyful in glory; let them sing aloud upon their beds; let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the heathen, and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written; this honor have all the saints. Praise ye the Lord." (Psalm cxlix., 5-9.)

"But that which ye have, hold fast till I come. And he that overcometh and keepeth my works to the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers; even as I received of my Father." (Rev. ii., 25-27.)

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat on him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness doth he judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written which no man knew, but he himself; and he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies in heaven followed him on white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he might smite the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written: Lord of lords, and King of kings. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven: Come and gather yourselves together to the supper of the great God; that you may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of

captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war upon him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them who have received the mark of the beast, and them that worshiped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat on the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth; and all the fowls were filled with their flesh." (Rev. xix., 11-21; see, also, Jer. li., 20.)

The Christian soldier, now, clad in the panoply of heaven, following the humble footsteps of his Leader, is to fight the battles of the Lord with the "sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God" (Eph. vi., 17.); and when the great Captain, riding on the "white horse" and "wearing the many crowns," shall come, then he, too, will constitute one of that splendid retinue composing the "armies of heaven" on "white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean;" and as Israel under Joshua, by the authority of the captain of the Lord's host, destroyed the nations of Canaan and took possession of the promised land (Joshua v., 14), so these heavenly hosts, under the victorious command of their immortal Joshua, shall destroy their opposing enemies, and take possession of the heavenly Canaan, the everlasting inheritance.

Beloved reader, God, in his great mercy, grant that you and I may constitute a portion of that sacramental host. A.

A.'s ARTICLE.—The preceding is the calm judgment of an excellent man of ripe years, large experience, and good heart. Its conclusion is my profound conviction. Whenever Christians come to see war in the light in which Christ and the New Testament treat it, the result will be a decision on their part to suffer, if need be, even martyrdom itself before they will obey any government on this earth commanding them to engage in it. That they will ever come so to view it is more than I can hope as long as we are in the flesh. Still this should not deter us from working to render the conviction as nearly universal as possible. It may suit the religious demagogue to defend war, and urge that Christians can innocently take part in it; but this is no task for the Christian. His mission is one of peace, not one of war; and he should never admit that the emergency can, by possibility, arise when he will abandon it for one of boundless passion and bloodshed. Let all Christians work to give this sentiment currency.

A FEW WORDS ON MISSIONARY SOCIETIES.

Just now our papers, monthlies and weeklies, are abounding in discussions on missionary societies, the grounds of their existence, their claims to confidence, and their deeds. In all this, I must say, I have pleasure. If these societies are wrong, the end will be their abandonment; if right, they will be left standing on their true basis. This is inevitable. Both by their friends and by their enemies are they closely watched. Neither their virtues nor their faults are therefore likely to escape detection. In regard to them, consequently, I feel that all things are working well.

It is not claimed for missionary societies that the New Testament creates them. On all hands, they are allowed to originate in the discretion of men. On what ground, then, can their existence be defended? In answering this question, several items must be taken into the account.

1. *The Motives of Those who Create the Societies.*—These must be pronounced good, faultlessly good. That men are moved to form these societies by the sole desire of seeing what they deem to be the truth spread, can not be denied. That this desire is right, is not disputable. Hence, from the motives in which these societies originate, no argument can be deduced against them. But I crave not to be misunderstood. I am not arguing that the societies are right, because the motives from which they spring are good; but merely, that since these motives are good, the societies themselves can not be from this source shown to be bad. On this score, therefore, they are entitled to complete exemption from censure and even objection.

2. *The Work they Do.*—They simply cause the gospel to be preached. Certainly this, and this only, is their work; and where they attempt aught else, then I feel that they forfeit claim to the countenance and support of the brethren. Where they attempt to become a monopoly, and to manufacture any portion of the books of a religious body, as is the case with the Cincinnati society; or where they degenerate into a political clique, and attempt to shape the political sentiments of the community by passing political resolutions, as did the society just named; I then feel that they have so far departed from their legitimate work, that, without blame attaching to any one, they may be left to perish. Even in this case, however, I grant the question to be a very proper one, whether it is not better and wiser to attempt to redeem such a society from its errors, and to render it yet all it should be, than to allow it to become a ruin and a reproach. I must confess I think the latter the better course. But societies, to avoid all these

perils, should avow their sole object to be the propagation of the truth ; and after this, they should allow no emergency or cause to swerve them from their avowal. This persistently done, and I feel sure that one weighty objection against these societies would be completely set aside.

Now, that to cause the gospel to be preached is right, no Christian will deny. When, then, this is the work, and the only work, of a society, it is difficult to see how, from its great characteristic act, any sentence can be extorted against it. Indeed, I believe the attempt would never be made. Missionary societies, then, such as I am now speaking of, are certainly right, provided any purely discretionary organization is right, which springs from faultless motives, and performs only a faultless act.

3. *The Manner in Which these Societies Do their Work.*—This unquestionably is identical with the manner in which any given congregation of disciples does the same work. It consists simply in raising money by voluntary contributions, and in employing therewith good men to go out, generally into destitute regions, and preach the gospel. To this surely no objection can be urged ; for if the manner of the church be right, that of the society can not be wrong. On what ground, then, can we condemn these societies ? They are right in the motives from which they spring ; right in their act ; and right in the manner of it. All this is certainly and weightily in their favor. But here objections arise, which it is now proper to notice.

First, these societies are not provided for in the New Testament, but originate in the discretion of men. Certainly this is all true, and hence should be at once granted. Is it now true that every association of men, society, and thing not provided for in the New Testament, which undertakes to do any work made necessary by it, should be repudiated ? If not, then certainly missionary societies may be right. No position can be clearer than this ; none more just and logical. The New Testament clearly creates the duty to have the gospel preached. But this is the work which the missionary society, to the extent of its ability, proposes to do. May it do it ? The opponents of these societies say not. But why ? Simply because the society is not the creature of the New Testament. Is this inference fair ? If so, then, beyond doubt, it is fair against everything having the same origin with the society, and doing the same work. This no man, with a logical brain and who is just, will deny. Let the position, then, be tested.

I am printing a *Quarterly*, the avowed object of which is the propagation and defense of the gospel. But this *Quarterly* is unknown to the New Testament. Should I therefore abandon it ? Not an honest man in our ranks will affirm it. But this *Quarterly* has precisely the same origin which the society has—human discretion, and not only

proposes, but actually does, the same work. If, now, my *Quarterly* is right in itself, that is, if it has a just and legitimate existence, and may lawfully do the work it proposes, then the man does not live who can show that a missionary society is *per se* wrong, and may not cause the gospel to be preached. With emphasis, I plant myself here; and maintain that the same argument which would rebate a missionary society because it originates not in the New Testament, and would deny to it the right to cause the gospel to be preached, must of necessity rebate the *Quarterly*. And in candor I must go further, and say I have no respect for the dullness which perceives not the analogy, nor the casuistry which denies to the resulting conclusion its just weight. Moreover, if the *Quarterly* should be rebated for the reason alleged, then certainly the *Harbinger* should be, the *Review* should be, the *Standard* should be, and so should every other paper in our ranks. Nor is there a man among us who can consistently maintain his right to print a paper, and through it preach the gospel, and at the same time deny existence to a missionary society, and the right to do the same thing. To multiply illustrations and analogies is idle. I shall confine my reasoning strictly to things belonging to the same category with missionary societies, and thereby make it conclusive. I hence say nothing of colleges, orphan schools, meeting-houses, etc. These could serve only to amplify, and possibly might confuse. They could add nothing to the argument.

To assume that Christian men may do nothing and use nothing except what is specifically and expressly provided for in the New Testament, is wholly untenable, and is violated every day by the very men who oppose missionary societies. Certainly, in preaching the gospel, we are to preach precisely and only what the New Testament teaches, and this without the semblance of modification; yet even here we claim the right to use a very large discretion. Our arguments, for the most part, are our own, especially the form they take; our illustrations are our own; so is most of the language we use. In all these items human discretion guides us; nor does any one seem to think it wrong. Also, in practical matters, we must do as Christians precisely and only what the New Testament enjoins; but the *mode* in which we shall do it is certainly not prescribed. Here our discretion becomes our guide. I am to give to him who asks me; but the mode of doing it is not stated. I am to minister to the necessity of the saints, but how is not laid down. I am not to neglect assembling with the brethren, but where is immaterial. I may meet in a grove, in a tent, in a cave, in a meeting-house, in a private dwelling; and in all these places I equally keep the command. I am to immerse him who confesses his faith in Christ and demands it; but whether in a stream or in a baptistery, whether face downward or upward, is not specified. Here I am left to my own discretion. I am

to break the loaf and drink of the cup ; but whether I shall do this standing or sitting, whether I shall go to the table and break and drink for myself, or allow the emblems to be brought to me, these and other points are not decided by the New Testament. They are left to the taste and discretion of the saints.

In like manner the gospel must be preached. This none denies. But how shall it be done,—by those only who are sent out by some church ? Anciently those who were scattered abroad by persecution went everywhere preaching the word ; yet not one of them was sent by the church. The above position, then, is false. Were I able, might I not send out a man to preach the gospel ? All will answer yes. But were I only half able, might I not unite with another, and we two send out a preacher ? It will hardly be denied. But what is this but the missionary principle in operation ? On what just ground, then, can it be objected to ? I confess I do not see. For whether I unite with one man or ten to send out a preacher is clearly immaterial. But I am told that I must place my means at the disposal of the congregation, and let it send out the preacher. *I flatly deny it.* That I may do so, I readily grant ; but that I am bound to do so, I do not grant. Neither is it denied that the individual church may send out a preacher, nor yet that it is her solemn duty to send out fully as many as she may be able to send. All this is strenuously maintained. But that a preacher may go at the charges of none but the individual church, this is what is denied. Let those who affirm it make it good before they say aught more against missionary societies.

But here again I must beg to be understood. I am no great advocate for missionary societies ; especially I am neither the advocate nor the apologist for any particular one. But what I do advocate and maintain, with strong, healthy will, is *the right of the brethren to have and use these societies if they see fit.* This extent unconditionally hath my advocacy, no more. If societies are efficient and do right, I am their friend ; if not, my wish is their end. Not only do I maintain the right of the brethren to use these societies, if they choose, but I am willing and anxious to see them exercise this right till a full test has been made of missionary societies. This done, if from any cause it should become apparent that the societies should be brought to an end, then will I be ready for the work. As these societies are not enjoined in the New Testament, no one will seek to force them on the brotherhood. I, at least, will not. But as they are discretionary, that is, as brethren may have them if they so will, those brethren who want them will neither be browbeaten down themselves, nor will they allow the societies to be browbeaten down. This the opponents of these societies may count on with certainty. There is, then, but one honorable way to get rid of the societies—give them a fair trial ; and if they prove a failure, my word for it those very brethren who

are now their friends will forthwith abandon them. Hence they give me no fear. I therefore think there is no necessity either very hotly to defend them or very hotly to oppose them. On each side brethren have at times become a little too warm; and in excessive warmth we are not always perfectly fair. Some of these societies have unquestionably done good, and good on a scale and in a way to indicate that all might be made useful if judiciously managed. Let them now be tried under favorable, not under unfavorable circumstances. Let no obstacles be thrown in their way; let them receive no discountenance from strong brethren, then shall we in a few years clearly see what they are. It is not right to bring the whole weight of our influence to bear against them; to cripple them in every way in our power, and then point to them as failures. Failures under these circumstances they must certainly become; but then we could hardly feel satisfied with the result. I, for one, should not. I should always feel that had we treated them differently they might have met our expectations, and done for us a work of which we might have been proud. I should regret to see them brought prematurely to an end. Besides, they have many warm friends in our ranks; among these I recognize some of the best men we have. For these brethren I have a high and tender regard. They confidently think these societies can be rendered eminently useful. They hope more from them, I readily grant, than I do. I want now to see these brethren have a full and fair opportunity to test the societies; and while doing so, for a reasonable time at least, they shall have my countenance and hearty support. But other objections demand a brief notice.

Second, these societies, we are told in substance, are made substitutes for the churches, and undertake to do a work which the churches alone should do. 1. The societies are made substitutes for the churches. Whenever a brother takes this position, with the ability to comprehend his act, I at once set him down as a religious demagogue. No one proposes to substitute a missionary society for a church, or to supplant the one by the other, or in any way whatever to interfere with churches or their work. The position is wholly untrue. Missionary societies are substituted for churches neither intentionally, accidentally, nor in any other way. Nothing could be more unjust to the societies than such a charge; nothing more unjust to their friends. Could a solitary instance be adduced in which a society was interfering in any way injuriously with a church, no brethren could be found more ready to work the death of that society than the very men who are now the warmest friends of the societies. These brethren are just as jealous for the churches, their unabridged rights, their authority, in a word, everything essential to them as churches, and their usefulness, as are the most zealous and conscientious opponents of societies among us. Belief that missionary societies can be

rendered eminently useful, and should therefore be used, by no means implies abandonment of the churches, or a willingness to see them in any way crippled. All such charges are groundless, and gratuitously wounding to the feelings of good men who love Christ with their whole hearts and spend their lives in his service. Certainly, when uttered, great incaution is displayed. . 2. The societies undertake to do a work which the churches alone should do. This statement may or may not be true, according to the circumstances of the churches. If the churches were able to cause the gospel to be preached in all places, unquestionably, I should say, they ought to do it ; but such, we well know, is not the case. Now where this inability is known to exist, and yet by the creation and use of a missionary society we can send the gospel where without this instrumentality it would not go, I hold it to be not only right to create and use the society, but a solemn duty to do so. Should any one demand proof that in this I am right, I must respectfully say that I decline even an attempt at compliance. Some things may be debated, others are too obvious to require it. Even the dignity of truth may sometimes be compromised by consenting to put it in controversy. But there is still another case to be noticed. Suppose the churches to be able to cause the gospel to be preached, but unwilling, what then ? May we create a missionary society ? Not at all, say the opponents of these societies ; but go to work on the churches and get them right. Very well, what has been the success in this line of those who have been all the time opposing missionary societies, and, of course, working on the churches ? Have they succeeded in getting the churches right ? Are the churches on which they have wrought one whit ahead of those where missionary societies exist, and where, by assumption, the churches must be neglected ? Very far from it. My own opinion is, that the churches where missionary societies are not are more lifeless and inefficient than those where they are. I feel thoroughly satisfied that a comparison of facts would fully sustain this opinion. Hence, before brethren further oppose missionary societies on the score that all the work in our power should be done on the churches, and all the preaching that is done should be done through them, let them show a more prosperous state of the churches and greater efficiency in causing the gospel to be preached where these societies are not than where they are. Then shall I feel that they confront us with facts, and that they have an argument against these societies. Till then I shall continue to feel, as I now feel, that although objections, true and relevant, have, pending the controversy, been urged against these societies, still, up to the present, not even one thing rising to the dignity of an argument, in the true and proper sense of the word, has been constructed against them. Nor in this is there expressed even the slightest wish either to underrate or impair the

force of what has been said by the opposition. My only desire is to be just to these societies, just to their friends, just to their opponents. Still, up to this writing, I am bound to confess that in the controversy I think the argument wholly with the friends of the societies, and the *ad captandum* on the other side. In this I grant brethren may think me partial. I should scorn to be so, except where stern right demanded it.

Third, missionary societies are liable to abuse the authority they have, and to usurp that which they should not have. Every word of this objection I believe, and desire it to be felt in its full force. That these societies are so liable, I think no candid observer of their workings can deny. Still, they are not extremely so liable; hence this amounts simply to an objection, but not to a strong one. Every institution, both of Christ and men, is liable either to abuse or to be abused. Hence bare liability to abuse may constitute either no objection at all, or a very feeble one. Not so, however, where the liability is extreme. This of itself, as an objection, must generally be accepted as conclusive. But since facts do not warrant us in affirming this of missionary societies, it consequently lies not as an objection against them. I hence deem the liability of these societies to abuse their authority no sufficient ground for disusing them. If, however, on trying them, it shall be found that they actually and as a general thing do abuse their authority, then I shall say let them cease to exist at once. For abuse, though slight at first, would soon become excessive, and this would be intolerable.

The liability to abuse, of which I am speaking, instead of demanding the disuse of these societies, merely demands, in my judgment, the greater caution on the part of those who manage them, and the greater watchfulness on the part of the brethren who sustain them. With this, no evil can result from them. If, then, they can be rendered useful, as I feel sure they can, and if they can be guarded against abuse, surely it is an act of the simplest prudence to have them.

Fourth, the work that these societies do costs too much. In this, I think, there is implied a just objection, and yet I view the statement as faulty. That missionary societies are an expensive instrument of usefulness, even their best friends will not attempt to conceal. But this, after all, may be no objection to them. The work they do is generally, indeed almost universally, work which would either never be done, or not be done at the right time. Besides, it is the work of saving the souls of men. On this work no estimate can be placed. Hence it is surely wrong to say of it, in any case, that it costs too much. If it cost a million of dollars to save one soul, still call it cheap. Let not this sublime labor be estimated in dollars and cents. Let no one ask the miser, with his interest tables, to aid us in making calculations here. If a missionary society is instrumental, in the course

of a year, in saving one soul that otherwise would not have been saved, we shall honor the society, thank God for the result, and never stop to ask the cost. Certainly, a given amount of work, if done by a missionary society, may cost more than the same amount done by a church ; but then the work done by the society, if not thus done, would remain undone. The true question, then, respecting it is not, What does it cost ? but, Shall it be done, or not done ? While, then, I am willing to admit that the foregoing is an objection, and even a legitimate one, still with me it falls very far short of demanding the abandonment of missionary societies. These societies I wish to try longer, and try under more auspicious circumstances. Then, if found unworthy, I shall say, down with them. Till then I am not willing to see them set aside. I have not, however, the slightest objection to brethren writing against them, provided it be fairly done. If they are really objectionable, especially if they are seriously so, let the fact be fully known. I ask for no concealment of their faults ; neither do I wish to see the least injustice done them. I repeat, let us have a fair trial of them ; and this, I hope, we shall have.

In the case of all missionary societies, I would keep them completely dependent, both for the means of their existence and the means of their usefulness, on the annual contributions of the brethren. I would never allow them to become independent moneyed institutions. It is hardly less than certain that in that case they would prove a curse. Here I would not make even one experiment. The history of the past renders it needless. We know what religious moneyed monopolies have been in times past. From this we can safely infer what they would be in time to come. Hence, let us be careful never to endow missionary societies. Keep them dependent, if you wish to keep them powerless for evil. The moment you make them fat, that moment they will try to crush you if you stand in their way. And from dogmatically claiming the right to cause the gospel to be preached, they will soon come to claim the right to do many other things not contemplated in their original formation. Endow a missionary society, and never can you trust it more. You have now created a man of sin, and bitterly will you rue it.

But I did not sit down to write a long article on missionary societies ; nor yet to argue their case in detail or with severity. Not at all. My object was in a short compass to define what I believe to be our true position to them, no more. What they are, we know well. The question is, What shall we do with them ? On this having now expressed my convictions, I am for the present done. As before said, they shall enjoy my countenance either till they prove failures or prove in some way so injurious as to demand repudiation. This I hope they may not prove ; but if so, with the fact my defense of them ceases.

THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

THE statement in Genesis concerning the family of Judah, at the time of Israel's descent into Egypt, furnishes Bishop Colenso one of his most cogent arguments against the historical character of the Pentateuch. The statement is this : " The sons of Judah ; Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah ; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. And the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul." (Gen. xlv., 12.) These are represented as the male offspring of Judah at the time that Jacob went down into Egypt ; for the list is prefaced by the remark, " These are the names of the children of Israel which came into Egypt, Jacob and his sons." (Verse 8.) The ground of objection is, that there was not sufficient time between the marriage of Judah and the descent into Egypt for this list of offspring to come into existence.

We propose first to state the objection in its full force, and then to consider its logical bearing upon the question raised by the bishop. First, then, as to the time. The 38th chapter of Genesis gives the account of the marriage of Judah, and, according to our English version, represents it as occurring about the time that Joseph was sold into Egypt. The record runs thus : " And the Midianites sold him (Joseph) to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's and captain of the guard. And it came to pass at that time, that Judah went down from his brethren, and turned in to a certain Adullamite, whose name was Hirah. And Judah saw there a daughter of a certain Canaanite, whose name was Shuah, and he took her, and went in unto her. And she conceived, and bore a son, and called his name Er." (Gen. xxxvii., 36 ; and xxxviii., 1-3.) The 38th chapter then proceeds to relate that Judah took a wife for Er, whose name was Tamar ; that Er died childless, and Tamar became the wife of his next younger brother, Onan ; that he died childless, when Tamar was requested by Judah to remain a widow till the next son, Shelah, should be old enough to be her husband. Tamar waits for Shelah, but Judah neglects to meet his promise, and seeing that Shelah is not given to her, she disguises herself, and plays the harlot with Judah, and Pharez and Zarah are both born to her at one birth, by Judah. Between this and the descent into Egypt, Pharez grows to manhood, and becomes the father of two sons, Hezron and Hamul.

Now, the shortest possible space in which these events could have occurred, is very easily ascertained. We will allow for the

space between the marriage of Judah, and the birth of Er, nine months	$\frac{3}{4}$ year.
From birth of Er to his marriage	14 years.
From marriage of Er to death of Onan	1 year.
From death of Onan till Shelah is old enough to marry	1* "
From incest of Tamar to birth of Pharez, nine months	$\frac{3}{4}$ "
From birth of Pharez till his marriage	14 years.
From his marriage till two sons born, supposed to be twins, nine months	$\frac{3}{4}$ year.
<hr/>	
From marriage of Judah to descent into Egypt,	32 $\frac{1}{4}$ years.

But if the marriage of Judah took place directly after the sale of Joseph, as the 38th chapter seems to assert, we have only twenty-two years, instead of thirty-two, for the above events. For Joseph was thirty when he stood before Pharaoh. (xli., 46.) Seven years of plenty and two years of famine had passed when Israel came down to Egypt (xlv., 6), making Joseph, at that time, thirty-nine. Subtracting from this his age when sold, which is seventeen, we have left only twenty-two years, which is the exact period between the supposed marriage of Judah and the descent into Egypt. This is ten years less than the above estimate requires, and would demand that five years each be taken from the ages of Er and of Pharez at marriage, making them only nine instead of fourteen. But it is impossible that they should have married at nine, and become fathers at less than ten years of age, unless a miracle be supposed.

There are only two alternatives by which to relieve the text of this difficulty. One is to suppose the two sons of Pharez to have been born after the descent into Egypt; the other, to suppose the marriage of Judah to have taken place earlier than the sale of Joseph. The former is adopted by Hengstenbergh, Kurtz, and other German authors, who insist that the language of Moses is not to be construed strictly, when he says of this list, in Genesis xlv., "All the souls which came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's sons' wives, were three score and six." Bishop Colenso ridicules this idea excessively, and insists that the author certainly does mean to say that every single one of them was born before the family came into Egypt. It must be granted that we would thus understand the above language, unless forced by the context or by the usage of the author to put some other construction upon it. But if we find evidence that the author was not speaking strictly, and did not intend to be understood strictly, we must allow this evidence its full force,

* Shelah being the third son, was probably only two years younger than Er. The above supposition makes fourteen the marriageable age, and supposes that Er and Onan were each married at that age, and that Shelah should have been.

or we shall actually misrepresent the author by insisting upon the apparent, instead of the real, meaning of his words. When it suits the bishop's purpose to find such evidence, he finds it and applies it with all readiness. For instance, in the very next verse to the one just quoted, the author of Genesis says : "All the souls of the house of Jacob which came into Egypt were three score and ten ;" although the context shows that Ephraim and Manasseh, who were born in Egypt, are counted, to make the seventy. The bishop explains this very satisfactorily, as follows : "The description is, of course, literally incorrect ; but the writer's meaning is obvious enough. He wishes to specify all those, 'out of the loins of Jacob,' who were living at the time of the commencement of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, and from whom such a multitude had sprung at the time of the exodus." (Part i., p. 72.) This is fair and sensible. It shows clearly that Moses did not intend his words in this verse to be understood strictly, and what an author intends must always be received as his meaning, whether he expresses himself accurately or inaccurately. But the discovery of this peculiarity of style when the number is stated at seventy ought to prepare us for the same peculiarity when the number is stated at sixty-six, provided we can find similar evidence of it in the context, or in the accompanying facts. Notice, then, what the author says about the family of Leah. He names her six sons, twenty-five grandsons, and two great-grandsons, and says of them all : "These be the sons of Leah which she bare unto Jacob in Padan-Aram." Now, according to modern forms of speech, here are three inaccuracies : 1. They were not all sons of Leah ; for most of them were grandsons, and two were great-grandsons. 2. She had not borne them all ; for she bare but six of them, and the others were borne by other women. 3. They were not all born in Padan-Aram ; for all of Judah's sons, according to chapter 38, were born in Canaan, one of Simeon's was by a Canaanitish woman (verse 10) ; and two of Reuben's were born after the first trip to Egypt for grain (xlii., 37, comp. xli., 9). These make ten, of the thirty-three, who were born after Jacob left Padan-Aram. Now, to use Bishop Colenso's own words : "The description is, of course, literally incorrect ; but the writer's meaning is obvious enough." He evidently says Leah "bore these to Jacob in Padan-Aram," because it was there she bare those from whom all the others were descended. This appears to us a strange style, but it is the style of Moses ; and when we are studying the writings of Moses we must interpret them by his style, and not by our own. This mode of speech being thus unquestionably employed in the context, it should be a matter of no surprise whatever to find it employed in another part of the same chapter. If, then, the facts are found to require the supposition that some of these great-grandsons of Jacob were born in Egypt, we may adopt it without embarrassment.

There is still further evidence that Moses does not intend to be understood strictly, when he uses the expression "came with Jacob into Egypt." 1. He counts Joseph, who did not literally come with Jacob; for he preceded him about twenty-two years. 2. He counts Er and Onan, to make up the seventy. He gives the descendants of Leah at thirty-three; those of Zilpah at sixteen; those of Rachel at fourteen; and those of Bilhah at seven; which sums make the seventy. But Er and Onan, who are counted, died in Canaan, and did not come into Egypt at all. 3. When he says "All the souls of the house of Jacob who came into Egypt were three score and ten" (verse 27), he includes Ephraim and Manasseh, who had never been out of Egypt. He can not have made these counts either for the purpose of deception; for he himself furnishes statements in the immediate context which would frustrate such a purpose by exposing it.

This peculiar inaccuracy of style in reference to genealogical tables was perpetuated in Jewish history. Thus the authors of the Septuagint, in translating this same chapter, go so far in this direction as to add to the list five descendants of Manasseh and Ephraim, and say "All the souls of the house of Jacob who went down into Egypt were seventy-five;" although they knew from the text of their own translation that seven of the number, that is, Ephraim and Manasseh and their five descendants, were actually born in Egypt. At a still later period we find Stephen, in his speech before the Sanhedrim, using the very words of the Septuagint, although he must have known that the count was made in this peculiar way. (See Acts vii., 14.) Thus, from the beginning to the close of Bible history, we find this peculiar style prevailing, and are forced, by a sense of justice to the inspired writers, to make full allowance for it in interpreting their words.

It may be well to remark just here, that we are by no means justified in inferring from the above that the inspired writers spoke thus inaccurately on all subjects. It is quite certain that they did not. Where they themselves give no evidence of a peculiar use of words, we are compelled to understand them according to modern usage; but where they do give such evidence, we are as certainly compelled to understand them according to their own usage. This law governs the interpretation of all writings, both sacred and profane.

I have said this much in defense of Hengstenbergh's supposition, not because I think it absolutely essential to a proper understanding of the facts in Judah's family history, but because it is a supposition highly probable, and may be very safely adopted by those who are not satisfied with the other alternative mentioned above.

It must, however, be confessed, that the 46th chapter of Genesis is most naturally understood as furnishing the list of Jacob's family as it actually existed at the time of moving into Egypt; and

we now address ourselves to the task of proving that such may be its meaning. In order to this, we have to suppose, as stated above, that the marriage of Judah occurred before the sale of Joseph ; but in order to this, we have further to assume that the 38th chapter, which gives the account of his marriage, is not inserted in its chronological place. The words of the English version would not allow this supposition, unless we further suppose that this chapter now occupies a different position in the book of Genesis from that originally assigned it by the author. Of this there is no apparent evidence. The words in question are these : " And the Midianites sold him (Joseph) to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the guard. And it came to pass *at that time*, that Judah went down from his brethren," etc. But the English is here much more definite than the original. The original term rendered "at that time" is very indefinite, and consequently does not fix with precision the connection of two events. If, then, the facts in the case imperatively demand the supposition that this record is unchronological, the expression here employed may, without straining its meaning, be construed in harmony therewith. We think that the facts do make this demand, and we now proceed to present them.

The first of these facts has already been presented above. If Hezron and Hamul, the grandsons of Judah through Pharez, were born previous to the descent into Egypt, as is apparently declared in Genesis xlv., then Judah must have married at least ten years earlier, as is shown by our calculation above. To the full extent, then, that the apparent meaning of Moses in the 46th chapter is probably his real meaning, is it probable that the marriage of Judah took place at least ten years earlier than Moses appears to locate it. His real meaning must be different from his apparent meaning, in the one case or the other.

Again : the woman whom Judah married was a Canaanite, and therefore it is most probable that he did not marry her until Jacob's return from Padan-Aram into the land of Canaan. But Joseph was sold at seventeen, and was six years old when Jacob left Laban ; (compare Gen. xxx., 25 ; xxxi., 41), consequently the return to Canaan was only eleven years previous to the sale of Joseph. This supposition, then, gives us just the number of years that our calculation demands ; allowing that Judah married during the first year after the return to Canaan. But it necessitates a modification of the popular opinion as to the time which Jacob spent in Padan-Aram. If he was there only twenty years, Judah could not possibly have been old enough to marry the first year after leaving there. Seven of those years were spent by Jacob in laboring for a wife before he married Leah. From his marriage till the birth of Judah, who was Leah's fourth son, must have been, at least, four years, consequently, eleven

of the twenty years had passed when Judah was born, making him only nine years old when the family returned to Canaan,—certainly too young to marry. This fact would at once set aside the supposition that he married the first year after the return, were it not for other facts yet to be mentioned, which unite with this in requiring us to suppose that Jacob was more than twenty years with Laban.

The first of these is the history of Dinah's defilement and the revenge of Simeon and Levi. This event took place at Shechem, the first place of permanent residence of Jacob after his return, and apparently during the first year of the return. (See Gen. xxxiii. and xxxiv.) But Dinah was Leah's third child after Judah and was consequently three years younger than he, or only six years old when they returned to Canaan. (See Gen. xxix., 31-35 ; xxx., 17-21.) Indeed, there is strong evidence that the two sons of Zilpah were also born in the interval between Judah and Dinah, for Leah had ceased bearing, and on this account gave her hand-maid to Jacob, that she might have children by her, and the birth of both of them is described before it is said that " God hearkened to Leah, and she conceived, and bare Jacob the fifth son, who preceded Dinah." (Compare verses 9-13 ; and 17 of chap. xxxi.) This reduces Dinah's age two years more, leaving her only four years old at the return from Padan-Aram. It is impossible that she was defiled by Shechem, and sought in marriage soon after the return, if this be her true age. Moreover, on the common supposition, Simeon and Levi were too young for the part they took in this affair. Levi was next older than Judah, and Simeon next older than Levi. When Judah was nine years old, then, Levi was ten, and Simeon was eleven ; quite a tender age for two young men to attack a whole village of recently circumcised Canaanites, and put them all to death. Again : Jacob's own history is rendered quite unnatural by the supposition that he was only twenty years with Laban. He was one hundred and thirty when Joseph was thirty-nine. (See Gen. xli., 46-53 ; xlv., 11 ; and xlvii., 9.) He was, then, ninety-one at Joseph's birth, and as he had been married only seven years when Joseph was born, he was eighty-four years old when he was married. This would give us a young man of seventy-seven summers starting out to obtain a wife, and then engaging to work seven more precious years for the proposed bride, before the marriage is consummated. The supposition that he spent forty years with Laban would make him fifty-seven, instead of seventy-seven, when he left his father's house ; and would remove all the other difficulties just mentioned, by adding twenty years to the ages of all the children of Leah. It would make Dinah twenty-four at the time of her defilement, and her avengers, Simeon and Levi, thirty-one and thirty respectively. It would also make Judah twenty-nine at marriage, if he married the first year after the return to Canaan.

We have now to inquire whether this supposition, which seems to be required by the facts in the case, can be reconciled to the statements about the time. The only direct statements upon the subject are those made by the historian (xxix., 20-30); and those made by Jacob himself in his speech to Laban (xxxi., 38-41). The former simply shows the time which he served for his two wives; the latter reads as follows: "This twenty years have I been with thee; thy ewes and thy she-goats have not cast their young, and the rams of thy flock have I not eaten. That which was torn of beasts I brought not to thee, I bare the loss of it. Of my hand didst thou require it, whether stolen by day or stolen by night. Thus I was; in the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night, and my sleep departed from mine eyes. Thus have I been twenty years in thy house. I served thee fourteen years for thy two daughters, and six years for thy cattle, and thou hast changed my wages ten times." Now, at first glance, this speech seems to speak of but one period of twenty years, which is first spoken of in the aggregate, and afterward distributed into two periods of fourteen and of six years respectively. But a closer inspection must throw doubt upon this conclusion. For notice, that during the twenty years first mentioned, Jacob says: "The rams of thy flock have I not eaten, and that which was torn of beasts I brought not to thee, I bare the loss of it." Here are two facts that could not have characterized the greater part of the twenty years last mentioned; for during fourteen of those years he was working for his wives he was eating the rams of Laban's flock, having none of his own to eat, and had nothing of his own with which to replace what was torn by beasts. During only six of the latter twenty years could this be true. Jacob's own language, therefore, instead of proving that he spent only twenty years with Laban, indicates that he was there forty years. The distribution of the time is clearly as follows: 1. He spends fourteen years in laboring for his two wives, though he receives them both at the end of the first seven years. 2. He continues to take care of Laban's flocks for such wages as Laban sees fit, without any special contract, to give him, for twenty years longer. During this period, he accumulates a small quantity of stock, and perhaps of other goods; but the small amount of his wages, and the necessity for restoring out of his small possessions all that is lost by wild beasts from Laban's large flocks, prevents him from making any adequate provision for his own family. In the mean time, his family has increased to eleven sons and one daughter, even his long barren Rachel having at last borne a son. 3. "It came to pass, when Rachel had borne Joseph, that Jacob said to Laban: Send me away, that I may go to my own place, and to my country. It was little that thou hadst when I came, and now it is increased into a multitude; the Lord has blessed thee since my coming; and now, when

shall I provide for my own house also?" Definite wages are now agreed upon, consisting of all the brown among the sheep and all the speckled and spotted among the goats. This arrangement continues for six years under various modifications ; for during the time Laban arbitrarily changes the wages ten times. (See xxxi., 7-13.)

With this correction of the common supposition as to the time of Jacob's sojourn with Laban, his family chronology is relieved of all further difficulty. He returns to the land of Canaan with children varying in years from six, the age of the beloved Joseph, to thirty-two, the age of the unenvious Reuben. His daughter Dinah is twenty-four years old when defiled by Shechem ; and Simeon and Levi, at thirty and thirty-one, avenge the outrage upon their sister. Judah, at twenty-nine, goes down to Adullam, near where Isaac is still living, and takes a wife from among the daughters of the land.

A significant change, characteristic of God's providence, now comes over the history of the family. Though God had promised Abraham an innumerable offspring, he dies at the age of one hundred and seventy-five, with only one son in the favored line of descent. Isaac, though heir of the same promise, marries at forty, but his wife remains barren for twenty years ; Jacob and Esau are borne at one birth, the only fruit of Isaac's only marriage. Jacob lingers about his mother's tent till fifty-seven years of age, when he goes to find a wife among his mother's kindred, and labors seven years longer ere his marriage is consummated. During a period of twenty-seven years, eleven sons and one daughter are born from two wives and two concubines ; an advance, it is true, upon the slow increase of his ancestors, but how slow a progress for a family destined by the promise of God to become as numerous as the stars of heaven. But God takes pleasure in apparent delays of his promises, to try the faith of his people. When this purpose is served, and the time of the promise comes, the world has ever been startled at the rapidity and certainty of his work. It is now time for the intended change in this family of Judah. In the short space of thirty-two years from his marriage, two successive generations of his offspring have married wives. This is the beginning of a precocity which makes his tribe outstrip all the others, so that upon leaving Egypt they are the most numerous of all, and Bezaleel, of the seventh generation from Judah, is old enough to superintend all the work of the tabernacle, though he is the cotemporary of Eleazar and Ithamar, who were only of the fifth generation in the time of Levi. The same precocity begins next to appear in the family of Benjamin, who, though only twenty-two or twenty-three years old at the descent into Egypt, is the father of ten sons. One-half of the period in which God had promised Abraham to bring his offspring out of Egypt with great substance (Gen. xv., 13-16.) has now passed away, and as yet they number only seventy souls ; more strictly

speaking, only sixty-eight ; but God has already begun to show the intended fulfillment of his promise, and a few more strokes of the historian's pen will show this little company of the sons of prophecy swelled to six hundred thousand men in the short space of two hundred and fifteen years. To show the possibility and the reality of so startling a result may serve as a task in some future number of the *Quarterly*.

LECTURES ON THE PENTATEUCH, BY A. CAMPBELL.

EDITED BY W. T. MOORE.

SUCH is the title of a book just issued from the press, and sold by D. T. and J. B. Morton, druggists and booksellers, Lexington, Ky. Altogether the book contains 379 pages, is printed on good paper, large type, and presents a very neat appearance. It claims to report with very substantial accuracy the lectures of Mr. Campbell, as delivered in Bethany College during the session of 1859-60. I regret that since a copy was handed me by Bro. Moore my engagements have been such as to prevent me giving the work the careful reading its importance justly demands before calling attention to it in any form. I can speak of it only from a hasty and partial reading. But even this much will enable me to commend the work to the public, especially to the friends of the great man whose lectures it aims to perpetuate in permanent form. I heard Mr. Campbell lecture from 1845 to 1849. No doubt differences existed between the lectures I heard and those reported in this book. Still these read to me much like those sounded ; so much so, that I should think the work a highly creditable reproduction of the lectures for the session to which it relates. No one can read the book without at once recognizing in it both the language of Mr. Campbell and his modes of thought. The latter, I should take it, has been somewhat compressed. This, however, is no injury to the book. The lectures I heard were certainly longer than those here preserved. But those I heard have perished forever, save as they live in the memory of a few living men. The present is the only record we shall ever have of those noble lectures. For it, therefore, I feel grateful, and hope our brotherhood will repay the care of Bro. Moore, by giving his book a wide circulation. Here are the grand utterances of a great man, who will only grow the greater the farther he recedes from the generation in which he died. Let all get the book and study closely its unequalled conceptions of the divine Volume and its contents.

THE COMMISSION.

"And Jesus came and spoke to them, saying: All authority in heaven and on earth is given to me. Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age."—*MATT. xxviii., 18, 19, 20. [Anderson's Translation.]*

THIS is the language of simple narration. The apostle Matthew here relates to us something of what Jesus did and said, and of what, just before he was taken from them, he commanded him and his fellow apostles to do. We have here five items. The first in order is what Jesus did; and the four following are what he said, or what he said, commanded, and promised.

1. "He came to them." This is what Jesus did.
2. He said to them: "All authority in heaven and on earth is given to me."
3. "Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."
4. "Teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you;" and,
5. "Lo, I am with you all the days, even to the end of the age."

We have understood that the Lord commanded his apostles first to make disciples of the nations, immersing them; and after this to teach the converted to observe the "all things" following. We have understood that the promise of the Lord to be with his apostles was subsequently uttered, and so was conditional—the performance on his part depending on the compliance of the apostles going before. But have we been correct in this?

How do we know but that the Lord first unconditionally promised to be with his apostles, and said he would be with them directly after saying, "all authority in heaven and on earth is given to me?" How do we know which of the two following injunctions came next in order? Was it, "Go, make disciples of all nations, immersing them;" or, "Go, make disciples of the nations, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you?" Did the Lord say, "immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" Or, into the name of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son, and of the Father? Or, into the name of the Son, and of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit? Or, into the name of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son? Or, into the name of the Holy Spirit, and of the Father, and of the Son? Which name was uttered first by the Lord Jesus—his own name, his Father's, or the Holy

Spirit's? How do we know which? How do we know but that the Lord enjoined the baptizing or immersing of the nations as the first thing, and the teaching and converting as the last thing?

Am I referred to the testimony of Mark xvi., 15, 16, as a parallel passage, by which the order of any item in this from Matthew may be settled? I ask, how? The passage reads: "And he said to them, Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is immersed shall be saved; he that believes not shall be condemned."

Very well. How do we know that Mark followed the order in which our Lord uttered the words which he here records? Did the Lord say: He that believes and is immersed; or, He who shall be sprinkled and believe? How do we know which?

Am I referred to Acts ii., 38, as explaining how the Apostle Peter understood the commission? This reads: "And Peter said to them: Repent and be immersed every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." I ask, how does this settle anything? We call not in question the record of Luke here? We will admit that Peter said every word that Luke testifies that he said. But what did Peter say first, what second, what third? etc. Does Luke give Peter's words in the order of their being uttered, or in an accidental order, that happened to occur to him? Can anything with certainty be affirmed of the order, either of our Lord's words or of the Apostle Peter's from the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, or from all their testimonies combined? If so, how? If not, what do we know, what can we know of their import?

Shall we appeal to Catholic or Protestant Christendom, to Baptists or Pedobaptists, to living doctors of divinity or to the works of the dead, to answer these questions? Where—how shall we begin, and how proceed? We wish for satisfactory answers or none at all. We wish for certainty, if certainty can be had; and if not, we would like to know it, that we may be governed accordingly? To whom shall we appeal?

The Baptist answers: The order of heaven is, 1. The Holy Spirit. 2. Remission of sins. 3. Repentance and faith, or faith and repentance. 4. Baptism, etc., etc. The Pedobaptist, understanding baptism to have come in the place of circumcision, says that infants as well as adults are the subjects of it; and agreeing with the Baptist in the necessity of "a work of grace, by the sovereign energies of the Holy Spirit," to be wrought on the heart of the creature before he can repent or believe, after making baptism a non-essential, adopts also the same order of the first three items. Each answers according to his own theory, creed, or confession of opinions. Ask the Baptist why he contends for the Holy Spirit first, and he will tell you, per-

haps, of the total depravity of the human heart. Ask him why he places faith and repentance before baptism, and he may refer you to the nature and fitness of things, and in his turn ask : "What good can it do an unconscious babe to baptize it? Is it fit, is it proper to do so?" Or, perhaps, he may answer that the relation of cause and effect exists between these items, according to his arrangement. Or some passage of Scripture may be referred to thus : "We read that the Lord commanded his apostles 'to preach the gospel to every creature;' then, 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' Again : 'And they were baptized, both men and women;' no infants are spoken of as the subjects of baptism," etc., etc., etc. "But infants were circumcised!" responds the Pedobaptist. "And by circumcision were brought into covenant relation to God!"

But our questions, after all, return to be answered : How do we know that the apostles recorded the commission of the Lord Jesus, and the conduct of those who obeyed it, in the order of their occurrence? No one's knowledge of the nature and fitness of things can answer them. The Pedobaptist, with his hypothesis, establishes infant baptism, and sprinkling for baptism, by the nature and fitness of things, quite as conclusively as the Baptist, with his hypothesis, establishes by it immersion for baptism, and the baptism only of adults. The question now for us is, Which, if either, hypothesis is the true one? If neither be wholly true or wholly false, how can we come to the knowledge of the truth?

If man, by nature, be so depraved that no exhibition of love or other motives can influence him to goodness, more than if they were addressed to a person naturally dead, then certainly it is plain that the relation of cause and effect must exist between the Holy Spirit and faith; or that some superhuman influence must—

"New model all the carnal mind,
And form the man afresh,"

before any one can either believe or repent. But how do we know that man is so depraved? If we be answered : "By the Scriptures;" again we ask, By what rule or rules are we so to understand the Scriptures? That persons may be baptized who have neither repented of their sins nor believed the gospel, we have abundant proof in applying the Savior's rule, "By their fruits you shall know them." The relation of cause and effect, therefore, can not necessarily exist between faith, repentance, and baptism. Nor, indeed, does this relation exist between any order of these items, nor of the others found in connection with them, not even that of the sacred historian Luke, in Acts ii., 38, of faith, repentance, immersion, remission of sins, and the Holy Spirit. We say not that no other relation subsists between them; nor that their order may not be as fixed as if they were connected by cause and effect; but we say, if they be thus fixed, it is

not the relation of cause and effect that thus fixes them. For it is God, and not baptism, that justifies ; who is he that condemns ? And the Holy Spirit proceeds, not from the remission of sins, but from the Father and the Son.

Being, by these remarks, brought back to our starting-point,—as no satisfactory answer to our queries can be drawn from any man's knowledge of the nature and fitness of things,—as the relation of cause and effect can not be shown to exist between the things commanded in the apostolic commission, in the order they are put down by the sacred historian, nor in any other order,—as neither the one nor the other can assure us that any particular order was observed in recording them,—we repeat the interrogation : Can anything, with certainty, be affirmed of the order, either of our Lord's words, or of the Apostle Peter's, from the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, or Luke ; or from all their testimonies combined ? If so ; how ? We shall see.

Before proceeding further, however, I would observe, that if anything certain can be affirmed of the order, it will not be ascertained by using here any body's hypothesis—theory, or, by any body's assumption or assumptions whatever, independently of the established laws of the language from which we deduce it. We must begin by analysis and proceed by comparison. We must first learn what we have to work upon ; and then, working like Bacon, Newton, and other great fathers of modern natural science, arrive at our conclusion, whatever it be, by induction. Beginning and proceeding thus, with a single class of words, *Βαπτίζω, Βαπτισμος, Βαπτισμα*, etc., the Baptists have arrived at immersion, as their primitive, literal, and only proper signification ; and resting in the truth of this, they have found it to be omnipotent. It has prevailed, it is prevailing, and it will prevail, till every man who fears God and works righteousness in every nation shall see it, cordially receive it, and be governed by it. So we believe, and so we speak. And thus must we proceed to fix the order, or to ascertain the order fixed, if any there be, in the apostolic commission.

The language of this commission, I have said, given by Matthew and Mark, and as acted on by Peter, as recorded by Luke, is that of simple narrative. It is not didactic, argumentative, nor poetic composition ; but historic. Let us, therefore, take under consideration a little of simple narrative, having no other connection with these passages than with any other of like character, and see if, by this means, we can find a rule to apply, and from which may be obtained the desideratum sought.

We will begin with the beginning of Genesis, the oldest book of history extant.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void ; and darkness was upon the

face of the deep ; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. And God said : Let there be light, and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good ; and God divided [separated] the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day." (1st chapter, first 5 verses).

"And God said : Let there be a firmament [expanse] in the midst of the waters," etc., "and the evening and the morning were the second day." (6th and 8th verses).

We have in this first chapter the record of six days' work ; but in no place in it is it said that any particular work was performed on the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, or sixth day, if the order of the simple narrative does not say this. Not until we come to the seventh day have we any explicit record of what was done in any given time, nor any order. I say none, if the order of the simple narrative does not fix it. "On the seventh day," it is said, "God rested." But it is not said that God created the heaven and the earth, and said, Let there be light, on the first day ; and, Let there be a firmament or expanse, on the second day, etc. ; but simply, that the first, the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth days were ; and that all consisted of evenings and mornings. And yet, what reader of the Bible ever supposed that these days did not occur in the order they are put down in the simple narrative ? What reader of the Bible ever supposed that the firmament was made before light ; or, indeed, that the order of the work of creation was at all different from the order of the words of the simple narrative ? It has, indeed, been objected to the Mosaic account of the creation, by some wiseacres, that according to it the sun, moon, and stars were not made till the fourth day ; whereas, light is spoken of as a work of the first day. But, though wiseacres they be, who seriously urge this objection, yet a little common-sense still remains to them ; for their objection shows that the order of the narrative, to their minds, fixes the order of the works. To the objection it has been replied, and replied justly too, that the original word, in the 14th verse, rendered in our common English version of the Bible, "lights," means light-bearers or luminaries. [In the Septuagint version, the word is *Φωσται* ; plural, *Φωσταις* ; which, in Robinson's Lexicon, is defined, "*(Φως, Φωζω.)* a door, or window through which light is admitted."] [But,] "in New Testament" [New Testament, and in the Old likewise] : 1. A luminary. (Phil. ii., 15.) *ἐν οἷς Φαίνεσθε ὡς Φωσταις ἐν κόσμῳ* " [among whom shine as light-bearers in the world]. So Septuagint, for Gen. i., 14-15. Whereas, *Φως*, which is properly rendered light, is the word which is found in the 3d verse. In a word, it is replied, that there is no more difficulty in light existing before there were luminaries, than in Adam's existing before Eve. But observe, all agree that the order

of the narrative here declares the order of the works. All agree that woman was the last of the works of creation, because she is last named in the order of the simple narrative.

We might go through all the history of the Bible in this way, or we might take in hand some other histories ; but let one or two passages more from the Book of books suffice. In the 5th chapter of Genesis, 32d verse, we read : " And Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth." If on this it be asked, Which was the eldest and which the youngest of Noah's sons ? we answer : From the order of the narrative, Shem was the eldest and Japheth was the youngest. Have we any other evidence than what is contained in this single passage, that our answer is a correct one ? Yes ; they are uniformly named in this order, wherever they are, by the sacred historian Moses, spoken of together. For instance, see a repetition of this sentence in the 6th chapter, 11th verse : " And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth." Again : 7th chapter, 7th and 13th verses : " And Noah went in, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives, with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood." [Observe the order.] " In the self-same day entered Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, the sons of Noah, and Noah's wife, and the wives of his sons with them into the ark." But we have other evidence,—I do not say better evidence, though better it may be for some,—that Noah's sons are named in the order of their seniority. In the 9th chapter, 24th verse, Ham is called the younger son of Noah, which settles the matter that he could not be either the youngest or the first-born. So Leah, in the sacred record, occurs before Rachel, she being the elder ; and her six sons are spoken of together, according to their seniority. (See 1 Chron. ii., 1.) Then Rachel's first-born, by her handmaid ; then her own children ; and, finally, the remaining three of the handmaids. Following this enumeration, Judah and his sons take the lead ; not for his seniority, but from dignity and honor. (See 1 Chron. v., 1-2.) But we must here consider a conflicting testimony. Chapter 10th., 21st verse, reads : " Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born." What say we to this ? We say, that the Hebrew word, which in this passage, common version, is rendered " elder ;" means primarily, not elder, but great ; and if properly construed with Japheth, should be here so translated,—*" the brother of Japheth the great "* And if otherwise construed, great, here as elsewhere, is its proper translation. This settles the conflict. We add, in the language of Bush : " The sense is in itself ambiguous. The epithet elder (Hebrew, great) may be grammatically construed either with Shem or Japheth. The Septuagint version adopts the latter, which is followed in the English ; the Latin vulgate the former. It will, we think, be found as a general rule, that where an adjective follows two substantives, in

a state of construction, it agrees with the former, as (Deut. xi., 7,) the work or doing of Jehovah the great.* The same Hebrew word, which, in Gen. x., 21, is rendered "elder," is here rendered great.

Again : in the second book of Moses, called Exodus, 29th chapter, from the 15th to the 19th verse, it is recorded thus : "Thou shalt also take one ram, and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. And thou shalt slay the ram, and thou shalt take his blood and sprinkle it round about upon the altar. And thou shalt cut the ram in pieces, and wash the inwards of him, and his legs, and put them unto his pieces, and unto his head. And thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar ; it is a burnt-offering unto the Lord ; it is a sweet savor, an offering made by fire unto the Lord."

From this lesson we learn that the hands of Aaron and of his sons were to be imposed on the victim for a burnt-offering before it was to be slain ; for so reads the statute. We know this was the appointment of God, from the order of the words in which the command was uttered ; we know that this was uttered first, from the order of the words in which it is narrated ; and Aaron is named before his sons, because of his priority in age, dignity, and honor. All other things being equal, the order of nature and of simple narrative is to name the elder before the younger, as in the case of Noah and his sons. And in the genealogy given of patriarchs, we have "Adam, Seth, Enos," etc. But when the younger stands above the elder in privilege, dignity, or honor, as did Jacob after Esau had sold to him his birthright ; the order is : "The elder shall serve the younger ; Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I slighted." And the name of Moses, in sacred history, occurs generally before that of his brother Aaron, though the latter was the elder. Nor would the law concerning this burnt-offering have been obeyed, had the ram first been slain, and the hands of the priests afterward imposed upon it. Nor would this law have been obeyed, had the washing enjoined been performed before the ram was cut in pieces, nor by any other departure from the order of what is enjoined as learned, and learned only, from the order of the words in simple narrative. Hence, we deduce the

GENERAL RULE,

That we know what is the appointment of God, only from the order of the words in which any command is uttered ; that we know in what order a command was uttered, from the order of the words in which it is narrated, and that the order of simple or historic narrative is the order of nature, is the order in which the acts, events, or whatever may be the subject of the narrative, occurred. If the subjects be

* Notes, Critical and Practical, on the Book of Genesis, by GEORGE BUSH, in two volumes. Vol. 1, p. 175.

something said or done, the simple narrative, to be true, must conform to the order of time. If the subjects be persons or things, the order of nature is rank or importance.

We return to the apostolic commission, and with our general rule before us as an antecedent, we say :

Therefore, Matt. xxviii., 18, 19, 20 ; Mark xvi., 15, 16 ; and Acts ii., 38, being all simple narratives of something said or done, the sacred historians were bound in their narratives to conform to the order of time. We hence conclude that Matthew and Mark, in recording what is called the commission of our Lord to his apostles, put down the words of Jesus in the very order in which he uttered them ; that he said : " Go, make disciples of all nations ; immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." That he said : " Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is immersed shall be saved ; he that believes not shall be condemned." And, consequently, as this was the order in which our Lord expressed himself, that his commands could not have been, nor can now be, obeyed, by departing at all from the order of his words. Putting both these passages of Scripture together, we understand that the gospel is first to be preached ; second, to be believed ; and third, to be obeyed. We understand that our Lord, in naming the persons (yes, the divine persons) into whose names baptism was to be performed, followed the order of nature, and therefore he said, first, Father ; second, Son ; and third, Holy Spirit. Therefore we are not at liberty to change this order. Nor would the apostles have obeyed the Savior, if, in baptizing, they had said : " I baptize you," or, " you are baptized," into the name of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and of the Father ; nor in adopting any other order of pronouncing these names than that uttered by the Lord Jesus, as recorded by his Apostle Matthew. We hence conclude that the Apostle Peter, understanding the Lord to mean what he said, and as he said it, said himself what the Evangelist Luke relates that he said, and in the order that he said it ; and therefore Peter meant to be understood by his hearers, and was understood by them, to answer the important question : " What shall we do ?" thus :

1. Repent.
2. Be immersed for the remission of sins.
3. You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

We say, Peter meant to be understood and was understood thus by his hearers ; because it is added by the sacred historian, in the prosecution of his simple narrative : " They, therefore, who received his words with readiness were immersed ; and there were added to the disciples, that very day, about three thousand souls." Had Peter meant to be understood and been understood differently, he would not have used either the words or the order of the words which he

now used ; but, like some modern apostles and doctors of human divinity, he would have said to his hearers in reply to their questions : First, you can do nothing till you receive the Holy Spirit ; wait for the Holy Spirit ; or, second, let every soul of you, great and small, be baptized, and then wait ; or, third, have your little ones baptized, and then pray for the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit for yourselves ! Had this been the case, the record following, too, would have been different.

I would here observe, by the way, that the Apostle Peter had before preached the gospel to his hearers, and it was manifestly believed by those who asked the question : " Men, brethren, what shall we do ?" Otherwise, we should have had faith in his answer expressed. In proof of this, I appeal to Paul and Silas in the prison at Philippi. The jailer said : " O sirs, what must I do to be saved ?" And they said : " Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and you shall be saved." After this, says Luke : " They spoke to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." After this ! [We follow the order of the narrator.] Had Paul and Silas preached the word of the Lord to the jailer and his family before he made the inquiry ; and had he, before making it, like Peter's hearers on the day of Pentecost, been pierced to the heart, and have manifested, as they manifested, that the question was asked on account of the effect of the word preached upon his heart ; we should have had no record here of faith being mentioned in the answer of Paul and Silas ; for they were not sent, like some modern " evangelical preachers," to preach faith, that is, to preach about it and explain it ; to tell the difference between historic faith, the faith of miracles, saving faith, etc., etc. No ; but they were sent to preach the gospel to produce faith. And having proclaimed it, the simple narrative continues ; the jailer, " taking them that very hour of the night, washed their stripes, and was immediately immersed, himself and all his. And having brought them into his house, he spread a table before them, and believing in God with all his house" (yes, the jailer and all his family believed), " he was transported with joy."

We said that Peter preached the gospel to his hearers, which they believed before they asked the question : " What shall we do ?" If so, what becomes of the " ancient gospel," to be found in Acts ii., 38 ? It remains there. But the gospel which Peter preached, which pierced his hearers to the heart, which they believed, and which caused them in agony to cry out, " What shall we do ?" had Christ in it,—had the love of God to them exhibited in the gift of his Son, the beloved, for their salvation,—had in it the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, in which there was power. " When they heard this, they were pierced to the heart !"

" Go, convert the nations," says the apostolic commission, " im-

mersing them." But how, by what means, convert them? An ellipsis here is to be supplied; and the important answer for this place we have in the testimony of Mark. What is it? "Proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation;" or, as it reads in the common version, "Preach the gospel to every creature." The gospel is the means of conversion. The gospel is God's power for salvation to every one who believes it, and therefore Paul was not ashamed of the gospel.

As it is important that we make distinctions where there are differences, and call all things by their proper names, let us examine a little the foregoing connection of Mark xvi., 15, 16. Our object now is, to ascertain just what is embraced in the glad tidings or gospel which the apostles were commissioned to announce for the conversion of sinners.

That Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of the living God, had been announced to them by the Father, and proved to them by the works which Jesus had himself wrought in their presence; that he died upon the cross, they also knew; but not understanding that it behooved the Messiah to suffer, and then enter into glory, when he died upon the cross, all their hopes of redemption by him died with him. Hence, said two of them, before they were well assured of his resurrection: "We had trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." They had trusted; but now they were filled with sadness. What, then, was the gospel, or good news? "Ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, who was crucified. He is risen; he is not here!" This was the good news, which was announced by the messenger in the tomb of Jesus to the women who visited it early on the morning of the first day of the week, after he was crucified, to embalm him. This is what they were commissioned to announce to his disciples and to Peter. For not believing this, the Lord (says Mark, in the 14th verse which introduces the commission) "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart." This, therefore, was the gospel, the good news, or the glad tidings, which the Lord himself commissioned his apostles to announce—the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, has begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead!" This was the gospel which Peter announced on the day of Pentecost; to announce which, he had to speak also of his previous death and burial. This, too, was the gospel which Paul announced to the Corinthians. It consists of three items, and they stand arranged in his first epistle to them (15th chapter, first, second, and third verses), thus:

1. "Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures.
2. "He was buried.
3. "He arose again the third day according to the Scriptures."

Is this all? Yes; this is all. We find no more in the testimony of Mark introducing the commission; we find no more in Peter's sermon on the day of Pentecost, which pierced his hearers to the heart; and Paul speaks of no more. And this is enough. "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world!" "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness," even so was the Son of man lifted up. "God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, that whoever believes in him may not perish, but obtain eternal life." "But we preach Christ crucified," says Paul; and "I determined to make known nothing among you" (Corinthians), "but Jesus Christ and him crucified." And to the Romans: "But God commends his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." This was the gospel, the good news, the glad tidings, which was, in apostolic times, has been ever since, and is now, to all believing it, "the power of God for salvation." This, wherever the Bible is possessed and read, need not be restored; for it never was lost. This it is which has made all the saints, called Christians, but out of the kingdom of heaven, and all the real Christians, to be found in the kingdom, and in Catholic and Protestant Christendom.

What do we say, then, of "the ancient gospel," restored by Philip the Evangelist, A. D. 1827? What is it? "Bro. Scott," says A. Campbell, "in the fall of 1827, arranged the several items of faith, repentance, baptism, remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life, restored them in this order to the church, under the title of ancient gospel, and preached it successfully to the world.*" "What do we say of this?" We say of it, that the items are all good, and they are properly arranged, being all, with the exception of the first and last, expressed in this order in Acts ii., 38; and no doubt, as an answer to the question, "What shall we do?" it was received as good news by the three thousand who first heard it on the day of Pentecost. But it is not the gospel, and should not be so called by Christians, if it be so by "Reformers." That these items are not the gospel will appear more evident, if it be not already evident enough, by considering for a moment longer the commission: "Go, preach the gospel; he that believes and is immersed." Believes what? Manifestly, believes the gospel. Is faith the gospel? What glad tidings is there in faith? None at all. It is not, therefore, he that believeth belief; he that has faith in faith; nor he that believeth baptism; nor he that believeth remission of sins; nor he that believeth the Holy Spirit; nor he that believeth all these, taken together, in this order; though, as we have said, in all thus arranged, there is good news to the convicted sinner; but he that believes the glad tidings concerning Jesus and the resurrection; that "he was delivered for our

* *Millennial Harbinger*, O. S., Vol. ii., p. 480.

offenses, and raised for our justification ;” the glad tidings of the love of God. This it is that convicts ; this it is that converts. O that this gospel were more proclaimed for the conviction and conversion of sinners ! I would rather denominate what is found in Acts ii., 38, therefore, the obedience of the gospel, or the things, and the ancient order of the things, by which all who have heard and believed, and by which all who shall hear and believe the gospel of the love of God in the gift of his Son, come under the reign of Messiah, and become participants of its blessings. What works, according to James, are to faith, the gospel is to Philip’s “ancient gospel.” It is the life and spirit of it, without which the latter is dead.

“Go, convert the nations ;” “Go, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation,” says the commission. What next ? “He that believes, and is immersed, shall be saved,—immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

Do you believe ? “Repent,—reform,” says Peter, “and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”

Here let it be observed that the commission enjoins immersion *into* the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ; and Peter tells his hearers that they must be immersed *in* the name of the Lord Jesus. Why did Peter say, “*in* the name of Jesus Christ ?” Because “*in* the name” imports “by the authority of,” and his commission to preach the gospel and to immerse was received from Jesus Christ. “*Into*,” in this place, imports the object or end for which immersion is performed. It imports a change of state and relations ; and not only so, but the coming under new obligations. As, therefore, the authority to immerse is derived from Jesus, as the Messiah and Son of God ; and the language of his commission reads, “Go, convert all nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit ; we conclude that the Pentecostian converts, and all others who were made under the preaching of the apostles and their associates, were immersed, not only in the name or by the authority of the Lord Jesus, but into the names here associated with his name. As the names of the Father and of the Holy Spirit are both found in this commission in connection with the name of the Son, no person could be immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus without being immersed into the names of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, we have no more authority from Jesus Christ to immerse into his name alone, than we have to sprinkle an infant, or to do anything else not commanded. Are we asked : What, then, mean those passages of Scripture which speak of persons being immersed “into the name of the Lord,” and “into the name of the Lord Jesus,” where no other name is mentioned ? We answer : The names, “Lord,” “Lord Jesus,” and “Son,” all belong to the same person,

therefore, when believing penitents were immersed into the name of the Son, according to the commission, they were immersed into the name of the Lord and of the Lord Jesus.

Have you reformed and been immersed for the remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit? You know, then, what it is by experience to have your "heart sprinkled from an evil conscience;" you have "purified your soul" in obeying the truth through the Spirit; you have received the spirit of adoption, by which you cry: "Abba, Father!" You know that the fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace!

"Oh! how happy are they who the Savior obey,
And have laid up their treasures above!
Tongue can never express the sweet comfort and peace
Of a soul in Immanuel's love."

But we have not done with the commission yet. "Teaching them to observe all the things which I have commanded you." In hearing the gospel, in believing and obeying it, we only begin the Christian life. We are now to add to our faith, courage; and to courage, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, love;" for these things being in us and abounding, will make us to be "neither slothful nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." So Paul taught. But how shall we do these things? Answer: By observing all the things which the apostles taught the first Christians to observe. We must go back to Jerusalem, and to the day of Pentecost. We must learn by example as well as by precept. "Teaching them," says the commission, "to observe all the things which I have commanded you." The ellipsis here after "you," is supplied by some, with the words, "to observe;" and by others, with "to teach them." Though I incline to the former, yet we have good sense, and nothing materially affecting the sense, if we adopt the latter. It is all the same to us, whichever be the supplement; for what the apostles taught the first Christians, or the first things, can only be learned from the record given us of their conduct.

What, then, is said of the conduct of those who obeyed the gospel on the day of Pentecost? It is said: 1. "They were added to the disciples;" and after this, that they constantly attended to the teaching of the apostles, to the fellowship, to the breaking of the loaf, and to the prayers." This they did, as disciples and associated together in a church of Christ.

Here, if anywhere in the New Testament, we have the established exercises and order of Christian public worship:

1. The teaching of the apostles.
2. The fellowship.

3. The breaking of the loaf.

4. The prayers.

It will be observed that Acts ii., 42, like the 38th verse of Acts ii., and like Matt. xxviii., 18, 19, 20, and Mark xvi., 15-16, is the language of simple narrative. And if our rule be a good one and fixes, as I contend it is and does fix, the order of faith, repentance, immersion, remission of sins, and the Holy Spirit, it is good for fixing, and does also fix, the order of observing the exercises of public worship. Whatever may be said of cause and effect, of the nature and fitness of things, and all the reasons which can be urged, so far as I have heard or can conceive of any, to prove either this or that ; all of them weigh not so much as a feather, in my estimation, when compared with this : *It is established by the order of the words in the simple narrative of the sacred historian.* Take away this, and our rule for establishing by it, and the order of both falls ; must fall, for it can not be sustained.

E.

PROTRACTED MEETINGS.—These meetings are generally held for the benefit of sinners, not of saints. For the most part, are they not too exclusively so ? I am much inclined to think they are. Certainly the gospel should be preached to the sinner ; but it may be preached to him with injurious exclusiveness. During protracted meetings the hearts of the brethren grow warm and mellow. Then is the time to make deep and lasting impressions on them. Besides, when the mind is in this frame, it will receive with pleasure lessons which, when it is cold, would either be heard with indifference or be rejected. I hence feel that no time is so proper as these seasons of refreshing to inculcate simple Christian duty. At no other time can it be so successfully done. Instead, therefore, of preaching exclusively to sinners, during protracted meetings, let a part of the time, say one-half, be set apart for the benefit of the church. Let the great chief duties of Christian life be now fully dwelt on. More can be done in this way during one such meeting than in a whole year in the ordinary meetings. Besides, from these instructions of Christians even sinners themselves will derive no small benefit, especially those of them who are serious and are thinking of confessing Christ. It is often the case that they are as deeply moved by these discourses as are the saints themselves. Nor are they at all distasteful to the sinner. He wants to know how he is to live when he becomes a disciple, and hence delights in them. The holy conduct pointed out in them he contrasts with his present evil life ; and as the result, he is brought to love that and hate this. He is made to feel, moreover, that there must be deep joy in living so pure a life. He knows there is little in living his life. In this again lies a benefit to him. Hence, let both the saint and the sinner be taught in these meetings.

ECCE HOMO.

SUCH is the title of a book courteously presented to me a few weeks since, by D. T. & J. B. Morton, druggists and booksellers, Lexington, Ky., with the request that I should subject it to a careful reading, and give my views of it to the readers of the *Quarterly*. The present article will be devoted to this task.

Ecce Homo is confessedly a fragment, an antecedent fragment, a fragment to be followed, it may be by another fragment, but still a fragment with a transparent meaning and definite object. Nothing can be clearer than the covert design with which the book is written. Its intention is the subversion of the authority of the New Testament, and the consequent extinction of Christianity. Hence, its popularity with a certain class of readers. Had a work of no greater merit than it possesses been written, defensive of the religion of Christ, or on some purely literary topic of the day, it would never have been heard of beyond the limits of London, if within these it originated; and within these limits could never have stood high. But it is an attack on the New Testament and its contents; hence the gratification it affords its lauding readers. It falls far below the rank of a great book. Of argument it is almost destitute. It abounds with little else than passionless assertions, which are delivered with an air of confidence, evidently felt to be fully competent to set aside all conflicting assertions in the New Testament. It is certainly the result of much thought; but it is not the thought which accepts the Christianity of Christ, but which creates out of it a christianity for itself. Christianity, as such, is as destitute of authority with *Ecce Homo* as if it had originated with Seneca. It is in certain of its features a morality, and is hence coldly liked; but had Socrates been only a little greater than he was, he might have been the author of it all. True in all its higher pretensions—its pretensions to a strictly divine origin and a strictly miraculous indorsement, it lies, clearly lies, only these strong words are not used in setting forth the fact; but these little pécadilloes are matters of so little account that they are tossed aside, and still a residuum is left which can constitute the fabric of a tale. But a little further on, we shall point out in detail some of the objectionable features of the book.

Since the days Christ spent on the earth to the present, the religion he came to establish has had its enemies. Nor will it ever be otherwise till the end is come. As long as Satan goes unbound, *Ecce Homos* will abound. The friends of Christianity will always have them to contend against. These enemies may vary their modes of

attack, but their numbers will not grow less. We need not fret ourselves over the fact, since thereby we shall not alter it. Rather let us prepare for the defense, and resolve to do our duty well. The result we can safely leave with God.

No feature of Christianity has been the object of more frequent attacks than that of miracles. Nor can we wonder at the fact. If the miracles of the New Testament never occurred, then Christianity is not tenable. Miracles, therefore, are the very foundation on which it stands. Hence, to attack these, is obviously to attack its very life. Success here would certainly be victory.

In attacking miracles, chiefly two methods have been used. The first and most common has been to deny outright that miracles ever occurred. Various has this method been applied. At one time it has been assumed that a miracle is antecedently so violently improbable, that no amount of human testimony can establish one. At another, that though no such antecedent improbability really exists, still the proof that a miracle actually ever occurred is insufficient. Each of these assumptions has had its respective champions. We all, perhaps, remember Hume, as illustriously connected with the former. Numerous, and for the most part now forgotten, have been those who have stood by the latter.

The second method has been to admit verbally, at least, the fact of miracles, but so to explain them as to make it appear that none actually ever took place. This is the method mostly in vogue at the present day. It is thought to be more condescending and delicate to indulge Christians in their childish belief that their great Master wrought miracles than grossly to deny them ; but at the same time care must be taken to show that to a true rationalism these were really only ordinary facts, susceptible of a very simple solution. True, it is allowed that they did not seem to be ordinary facts to the vulgar crowd that followed the Savior, yet they were so. I am, for one, free to own that I can not feel under obligation for these concessions. The man who, in the guise of a friend, admits in appearance the fact of miracles, but in heart and explanation denies them, is the enemy of Christ and man. I can not feel bound for his courtesies ; especially since I know their design to be to gain an advantage for their author which will enable him, all the more effectually, to stab the very life of Christianity. I like the man the better who boldly denies that Christ ever wrought a miracle. He claims no affiliation with Christ, and disavows any respect for the gospel. We hence know where to find him, and how to defend against him. But the man who comes piously forward, with honeyed eulogies in his lips on Christ and the gospel, who yet stealthily multiplies opportunities to pelt the life out of the former and falsify the latter—call not him the friend of Christianity. You offend me by the act. Such a man is *Ecce Homo*.

These *friends* of Christ remind me of the following, which I shall reproduce in my own words, for lack of the book in which I read it : Two physicians wanted the body of a perfectly healthy child for dissection. They watched their opportunity ; and one day decoyed a little boy into their office. One physician took him up on his lap, and dandled him fondly on his knee, and amused him with the sight of his gold watch. The other slyly placing his little feet in a basin of warm water, opened an artery. The little fellow smiled over his glittering toy, till at last his tiny head dropped on his pulseless bosom, and he was dead. So with these admirers of Christ. They are in ecstasies over the sermon on the mount, and talk with courtly eloquence of the uniqueness of Christ's life, his originality, his mastery over the wills of men ; but at the same time they are higgling over the question, whether twelve pieces of silver shall be the price of the blood they are drawing from his heart. I grudge them no pleasure their bad work may give them.

In discussing the fact of the Christian miracles, two things must be steadily kept in view : first, the character of him to whom they are ascribed ; second, the question, What is a miracle ? On both these items I deem a few thoughts a necessary preliminary, before entering into judgment in detail on the book before me.

Christ never claimed to be simply and only a man. This he certainly claimed to be ; but he claimed to be still more. Had he claimed to be merely a man—no more, and assumed to work miracles simply as such, his assumption could never have been sustained. In that case it must inevitably have failed. No man, as a mere man, claims the power to work miracles. And were any one so to claim, his claim would be universally repudiated, and for the best of reasons. Each man feels in his soul that naturally he possesses as much power to work a miracle as any other man ; and since he perfectly knows himself to be without the power, he would hence universally deny it to others. Nor is there any defect in this mode of argument. It is an easy matter for me to test by experiment that I have no power to work a miracle. It is equally easy for me to learn the same of my neighbor. The limits of power which I thus discover in us two, I at once, and justly, predicate of every other mere man. Hence my universal negative, that no mere man can work a miracle. Of course, if any one, as a mere man, actually wrought a miracle, this fact would utterly vitiate my reasoning ; but since this has never been done, nor the power to do it ever been claimed, such reasoning must be held as valid, and its conclusion true.

In order to support high above suspicion, the claim to the power to work a miracle, two things are absolutely necessary : first, the claim either to be a supernatural being, or to be possessed of the necessary power claimed from such a being ; and second, the act-

ual performance of a miracle. These two things are cognate and inseparable. The abandonment of the one is the abandonment of the other. Nor in thus proceeding can we be accused of reasoning in a circle ; that is, of attempting first to establish the fact of the miracle by the claim to the power to work it, and then the verity of the claim by the fact of the miracle. No. The claim, wholly unsupported, to the power to work a miracle is first made as an independent fact, and prior to a miracle. A miracle is then wrought. The reality of this miracle is avouched, not by the claim to the power to produce it, but by the eyes, and ears, and other senses of men sound in their senses and sane in their minds. When, however, the reality of the miracle is thus established, then we use it to prove the reality of the claim to the power to work it. Of course, if there actually is a miracle, then necessarily there is the power to produce it. Hence the reality of the miracle only establishes the reality of the claim, and not the claim the miracle. There is, therefore, here no circle.

Now, Christ claimed to be, not merely supernatural, but infinitely above nature ; that is, he claimed for himself, as inhering in him, and inseparable from him, and as underived from another, almighty, creative power. His apostles claimed to be, not supernatural ; that is, as by nature not endowed with any power above other men, but as simply possessed of supernatural power derived from Christ. Such indisputably were their respective claims. Here, therefore, we have the first of the conditions previously named.

Now, to ascribe a miracle to a being, such as Christ is here set forth as having been, is certainly not to ascribe to him what, by claim, he had not the power to do. There is hence, to say the least, nothing incongruous in the ascription thus far. That he would exert the power he claimed to possess, for an adequate object, is simply to say that his conduct would be determined by reason, not by chance. Was the object, then, for which it is alleged he did exert the power an adequate one ? That it was, I argue from two facts : 1. That men will not believe a claim to supernatural power simply upon the naked assertion of it. 2. That they can and will believe it on the evidence of miracles. Of course, it is here assumed that Christ came into the world to save men, and that one condition of this salvation is full belief in him and in all his claims. We repeat, first, that men will not believe a claim to supernatural power upon the simple assertion of it. For the truth of this we need not go beyond the evidence of our own bosoms. We know perfectly that were a person to claim to be in possession of supernatural power, and to give us no other evidence of the fact than his unsupported assertion, we would not believe him. Hence, to argue the point further is useless.

We repeat, second, that men can and will believe a claim to supernatural power on the evidence of miracles. For the truth of this

again we need not look beyond ourselves. Were we standing in the presence of a living man, and a lifeless human body ; and were we to see the man simply touch the body, and the body instantly spring into life and health, that we should believe the living man, were he to ascribe the deed to supernatural power, is just as certain as it is that the power of belief resides in the human soul. Hardly is our conviction stronger or clearer, that things which are equal to the same third are equal to one another, than would be our conviction, in the case supposed, of the possession of supernatural power. If we are asked why this is so, no answer can be given, except that the constitution of the human mind is such that it will thus act. Nay, we go further, and argue that the highest evidence of supernatural power which the human mind can conceive of, is the fact of miracles. He who demands anything different is unwise ; he who demands anything more is unreasonable. If a man claim to possess great poetic talents, the best evidence he can give that his claim is true is the production of a great poem. Should a man claim to possess the power to stop by his mere word the flowing of the Mississippi, indisputably the best evidence he could give of the justness of his claim would be to stop the river by his word. What other evidence he could give, with which we should be satisfied, we can not conceive. It is the best the nature of the case admits, and this is the least human reason can demand. Other illustrations are not necessary.

Now, when Christ claimed to possess supernatural power, or to be himself supernatural, surely the highest evidence he could give of the fact was to do supernatural things, that is, to work miracles. This is precisely what the nature of the case demanded, and it is all it did demand. With nothing less could men be satisfied ; with this they could not but be. The fact of a miracle establishes the possession of supernatural power. This is an intuition. The possession of supernatural power establishes the veraciousness of its possessor. If this be not an intuition, yet is it felt to be so overwhelmingly true that the mind refuses to doubt it. Such are the links by which the facts of Christ's life and the truth of what he said are bound together.

We are now prepared for the question, What is a miracle? If an adequate definition of one exists, it is unknown to me ; and to construct such a definition I find to be a task to which I feel myself not equal. Loose popular definitions are abundant ; but the least thought bestowed on them shows them to be defective. They all either contain something they should exclude—or exclude something they should contain. In lieu of them all, I shall submit the following, as my best, and yet it does not satisfy me :

A miracle is an instantaneous effect, produced by the exertion, at will, on the part of its author, of almighty power, and proving that what he says has the divine sanction.

Much might be said on this definition—much for it, perhaps much against it. I shall, however, content myself with pointing out its most important features.

1. A miracle is an *effect*. Effect is thus made the genus of miracle ; and, in logical language, it is its highest genus. That is the most general or comprehensive class of things to which we can refer a miracle, or which we can predicate of it, is effect. Of the accuracy of this classification few will have any doubt. Certainly it might have been slightly different, but without any advantage. A miracle, for example, might have been defined an event, or a fact, but with no benefit, as far as we can see.

2. But a miracle is an *instantaneous* effect. Were it otherwise, that is, were the effect a long time in being produced, it would be more difficult to believe it miraculous. In that case it would be more likely to be viewed as natural, though this would not necessarily be so. A miracle might be a long time in happening ; yet this was never known to be the case. A dead man, for instance, might be a month in coming to life ; and still the event be a miracle. But suddenness or instantaneousness was the universal accompaniment of the Christian miracles. It hence seems necessary to the idea.

3. A miracle is produced by the exertion of almighty power. If the power be not almighty, then it is not necessarily of God ; and if it be not necessarily of God, then it can not prove that he who exerts it speaks by the divine sanction. It must hence be almighty. But how, it may be asked, shall we know the power to be almighty ? The answer is, by its being creative. Almighty power alone can create. Hence where power creates, we at once infer that it is almighty, or that it is exerted by or derived from an almighty being. Certainly the power which can instantly give an eye to him who never had one, or reproduce the flesh on a withered arm, or enlarge a loaf of bread so as to make it feed a thousand men, must be creative. To argue the point would be idle. Indeed these are themselves creative acts ; and when once we establish the presence of the creative power, it is impossible to fix limits to it. Creation might then go on indefinitely.

4. The worker of a miracle must exert the power at will. This, indeed, is the highest evidence that God is with him. For if he possess the power, and can himself control it, then surely has he the divine sanction. Whereas, if he possessed the power without being able to control it, at the very time when he might most need his proof, it might fail him. In that case he might be looked upon as the mere medium of power, but not of revelation. Nay, more, the fact of being unable to control the power might be held to imply the divine distrust, and would hence be fatal. Of course, these remarks can apply only to the apostles and others, who wrought their miracles by derived power, and not to the Savior.

5. A miracle must prove that what he says, who works it, is divinely sanctioned. To do this the miracle must possess a specific character. It must not consist merely in the exertion of power in any way or for any purpose. Its nature must be such as to show that it springs wholly from benevolence and kindness ; and in all cases it must be beneficial to the subject of it. It must be wholly free from all appearance of evil ; and must have no vicious tendency. On the contrary, it must be of a nature to impress the mind with sentiments of goodness and awe, and to inspire reverence and respect for God.

Now that the miracles of Christ and of the apostles possessed all these characteristics, I need not attempt to evince to any one in the least acquainted with them. They were effects, instantaneous effects, effects produced at will by their authors, produced by creative power. They hence proved that their authors spoke by the divine sanction.

But did these miracles actually ever occur ? If so, few men will be found to deny in their teeth the truth of Christianity. Now that they did occur I hold to be evinced up to the last demands of human reason. But first a few words on their nature and the circumstances under which they occurred.

We have defined the Christian miracles to be effects. But these effects were all facts—facts in the severest sense of the word,—things done. They were effects relatively to the power which, as their cause, produced them, but still facts. These facts were, without exception, of a nature to be subjected to the severest test of the senses. This is all enlightened reason can require. A miracle is of necessity a fact. But a fact to be accepted as a miracle must first be tried—tried by the senses, since it can be tried by nothing else. But to be tried by the senses it must be addressed to the senses ; such, in other words, must be its nature that the senses can take cognizance of it and try it. Was this characteristic of the Christian miracles ? The answer to this question would of itself make a long article. In reply to it I can hence say but little.

No facts ever possessed more palpable traits than did the Christian miracles. They singularly varied, and were strikingly sensible. Yet all this, in our language, seems to have been perfectly accidental. The miracles of Christ were never premeditated and arranged beforehand. Like his speeches, the instant and the occasion drew them out. He never prepared to work a miracle. He knew he could work them ; hence no preparation was necessary. To him they were all alike easy. In no sense were they contingent. When he willed it, they must occur. He hence never preferred particular kinds, nor sought particular occasions. Any kind or any occasion answered him. Any place served his purpose,—the great crowd, the little circle, the sea, or the private chamber. Wherever and whenever the necessity arose, he met it. He neither shunned nor courted criticism.

Indeed, he acted as though there was no such thing. What the crowd said, or whether it said anything, seems never to have cost him a thought. In what light his miracles should be viewed appears to have been to him a matter of utter indifference. Whether men viewed them as mere tricks, the works of a practiced juggler, or as real facts evincing the power and presence of an almighty hand, gave him seemingly not even the semblance of solicitude. This could never have been the case with a deceiver. Had Christ been one, his life would have exhibited more of study, more of plot. It would have abounded in marks of caution. Yet never did life seem more purely fortuitous than Christ's. Where he should be in the day, or where sleep at night; in whose house he should dine, or whether dine at all; whether he should be riding in a fisherman's boat, or reclining at a publican's table,—these were matters upon which he seemed to bestow no thought. Yet with him nothing could have been really accidental. But with us, the marvel is that each act should seem so wholly unstudied, and yet so certainly be not accidental. Such is a most imperfect account of the circumstances attending the miracles of Christ. And what was true of his was also true of those wrought by the apostles.

But these miracles addressed themselves to the senses of men in a way which rendered it impossible that they should have been mistaken in regard to them. I hold deception to have been in the case out of the question. Those who witnessed these miracles were not deceived. They knew them to be real miracles, and have reported them truly; or they knew them to be tricks, and have lied. There is no middle ground. The very nature of the facts forbids any other view. To tell me that I am mistaken when I am standing and looking on a man all covered with leprosy, is to insult my eyes in a case where I am as profoundly satisfied that I can not be mistaken as I am that I live. If my senses here deceive me, let the vindication of the veraciousness of the senses from this instant on forever cease. Let no man say he sees what he sees, or hears what he hears. It is not so. He is simply deceived. Moreover, when a moment hence, I look on this same man, and his leprosy is gone, I can not be more overwhelmingly convinced of his existence than I am of the presence of a miracle. Especially is this my feeling when the fact occurs in the presence of one who claims the power to work miracles, and who actually affects to have exerted it in the present case. The nature of the fact and the attendant circumstances preclude even the possibility of deception. I may falsely report the case, but deceived I can not be.

Again: when I see a man with two arms, the one sound and useful, the other withered and useless, it is a mockery to tell me I am mistaken. These arms are not alike in look, in size, in use. Of these facts I am as certain as I am that the arms are simply two and not

ten. With the owner of these arms I have been acquainted for half a lifetime. I have walked with him, talked with him, eaten with him, seen him dress and undress, heard him regret his condition, known him to consult physicians, heard them prescribe for him, seen him bathe his arm, apply ointment to it, heard him describe how it felt, say he would give a world to have it restored,—all this I have seen, and still the withered arm remains. But in an instant, at the word of Christ, I see this arm restored to perfect soundness, and made like the other. Tell me not that I see not this. You outrage my senses and my reason by your act. If I have not seen this arm restored, then has the man no arm, he has six eyes, he has no mouth, no head ; for these my senses do not more reliably avouch than that cure. Indeed, tell me not that I see a man at all. It may be an ox, or it may be nothing. If my eyes have deceived me here, I shall never trust them more. I have no confidence in human eyes ; they are organs of lies. Indeed, there are no such things as human eyes. I deny their existence outright. When a man tells me he sees them, he tells me what is not true. He sees them not. Indeed, he has never seen anything, for there is nothing to see. There is no world without us. When the senses report one, I can not trust them. There is nothing. I am not sure that I myself exist. True, I think I do ; but then, I thought with equal force I saw that arm restored. But in this I was mistaken. Can I ever be otherwise. Reality is ended ; truth is dead. Such is the conclusion I at last reach, provided that arm was not restored. To deny it is worse than idle. There is no escape.

Still further : when I watch by the bed of a sick man day by day, and night by night, and perceive him gradually sinking ; when other neighbors attend and watch in like manner ; when I see anxious physicians attending, prescribing, giving directions, and administering medicine ; when, finally, I hear them announce that all hope of recovery is gone, and still I watch the sinking man ; when yet on I see the eye become fixed, and the tongue grow still, the breathing become feeble and still feebler, shorter and yet more difficult ; when, at last, I see relatives and friends gather near that bed to witness the end struggle, and finally see that troubled breathing cease, that body quiver, gasp, and then lie pulseless and still ; when now the wail of grief rises over that silent form, and I go and close those eyes and lips ; when I wrap that body in a winding-sheet, and perceive that it is cold and stiff ; when I assist to lay it in a coffin and screw down the lid amid the screams and sobs of agonizing kin—when I see all this, surely I can but feel that I am in the presence of a dead man. Deception is here impossible. The fact is of such a nature as to speak to my most perfect senses and to be tried by them. I can not be mistaken. I absolutely know, if there be any such thing as knowing, that the fact is as it seems. As well could I doubt my existence as

to doubt in the case. Even if I would, I can not. And now Christ is sent for and comes. He gravely stands beside that body. He is calm, collected, and modest. He makes no parade, uses no precautions, seeks neither publicity nor concealment, asks for no witnesses to be present, sends no one away. He uses no charms, prescribes no conditions, asks no faith, takes no fee. He simply touches that body and mildly bids it arise. In an instant it is replete with life, and moving among the crowd, talking and acting as in time past. How profoundly I feel that I have witnessed a miracle ! My whole nature is literally disgusted with the suggestion that I am mistaken. Not even for a moment can I allow the fact to be put in question. I am confident, dogmatic, and decline all debate.

Now what is here said of these miracles can easily be transferred to all that Christ and the apostles wrought, simply making such variations and modifications as the Holy Scriptures require. What was true of one miracle, was substantially true of all, differences in kind and circumstances being kept in view. Hence, in regard to these miracles, I repeat, those who claim to have witnessed them could not be mistaken. The very nature of the case utterly precludes such a supposition. That they have reported them to the world is a universally admitted fact. How truly I have not here the space to argue.

Now on these miracles rests the whole superstructure of Christianity. It stands only with them, or with them goes down. They are its guarantee and proof. By them it arose ; by them it is still supported. If they never occurred, it is a fable. If they are not received, it must be rejected.

In what light now does *Ecce Homo* hold these miracles ? Does he accept them, or does he reject them ? It is not exactly certain what answer should be given to these questions. We shall hence let him speak for himself. On this point accordingly I cite the following :

"Miracles are, in themselves, extremely improbable things, and can not be admitted unless supported by a great concurrence of evidence. For some of the evangelical miracles there is a concurrence of evidence which, when fairly considered, is very great indeed ; for example, for the resurrection, for the appearance of Christ to St. Paul, for the general fact that Christ was a miraculous healer of diseases. The evidence by which these facts are supported can not be tolerably accounted for by any hypothesis except that of their being true. And if they are once admitted, the antecedent improbability of many miracles less strongly attested is much diminished. Nevertheless, nothing is more natural than that exaggerations and even inventions should be mixed in our biographies with genuine facts."

The first part of this extract, were it from a book free from suspicion, could hardly be pronounced objectionable. But coming, as it

does, from a skeptic, we can but regard it with distrust. The extreme caution which it displays is the precise circumstance which invests it with its dubiety. It is too wary and shy of an open avowal. A concession it may have been designed to be ; but if so, it is utterly destitute of heartiness and affirmativeness. It is too fastidiously conceived and too daintily expressed. "Miracles are, in themselves, extremely improbable things." This statement is ambiguous. In one view it is true, in another it is not. Conceding that Christ possessed the power to work miracles, and it is extremely improbable that he would exert that power for an inadequate end, and certain that he would not exert it for a trivial or unworthy one. In this view miracles are extremely improbable, in no other. But that he would work miracles to authenticate a religion which invests man with immortality and eternal life,—a religion which is not an intuition, which could not be accepted on his naked assertion that it is true,—a religion which could be accepted only on the ground of miracles, and which could not but be accepted on that ground—that Christ would work miracles to establish a religion of this kind is not only not extremely improbable, but, on the contrary, is probable, antecedently probable, up even to the last degree in the extreme. This we hold to be too clear to need more than a bare statement.

Again : miracles "can not be admitted unless supported by a great concurrence of evidence." This statement can have no effect but to bewilder. It is the embodiment of muddy thought. Who can decide what constitutes a "great concurrence of evidence?" Not the undisciplined mind of youth, I am sure. The evidence, and the only evidence, which is required to establish the fact of a miracle is that which in kind and degree is sufficient to satisfy an honest man of good mind, who leans dangerously neither to nor from the point in issue. This is all human reason requires ; and when this is satisfied, faith should supplant skepticism.

Further : "For *some* of the evangelical miracles there is a concurrence of evidence which, when fairly considered, is very great indeed." Still, whether great enough to establish these miracles is matter of inference, and not asserted. This is cunning. Why did not *Ecce Homo* tell us outright that this "concurrence" is sufficient, or is great enough? Ah, this would have defeated his aim. He wanted, while seeming very fair and very innocent, to thrust the knife to the very heart of Christianity. He weighs for us evidence in scales exquisitely balanced, but then so curiously notched that we can never know how much they draw. There is art in this. Coat Christianity over with ambiguity, and you have sealed its death-warrant.

"For *some* of the evangelical miracles, there is," etc. Of course, then, for others there is not. These, therefore, can not be "admitted." This is enough. Which now are the miracles for which this very

great concurrence does exist ; and which are those for which it does not ? And now the human mind, so easily determined to evil, is agog and engaged in the work of sifting. Will it surely succeed in separating the miracles which can not be "admitted" from those which can ? Perhaps so ; but how is it ever to know the fact ? Too many questions are sometimes very impertinent things. All the Devil wants, is for the human family to admit that for two or three of the "evangelical miracles" there is a "very great concurrence of evidence," but that for the rest no such concurrence exists. For the upshot, he may safely assume to be responsible. Which the two or three are for which the concurrence exists we can never decide. *Ecce Homo* selects the two or three for which, in his judgment, it exists. But these I reject, and select mine. These, in turn, he rejects. And now we have confusion, dissension, quarreling. These are endless, and till ended Christianity is rejected. The work is done.

But "nothing is more natural than that exaggerations and even inventions should be mixed in our biographies with genuine facts." Certainly nothing is more natural, provided Christ and the apostles were liars ; but if they were not, that they should deliver to us inventions for real facts is the most unnatural and unlikely thing conceivable. But allow that "our biographies" are a compound of "exaggerations," "inventions," and "genuine facts." Which are the "inventions," and which the "genuine facts ?" Are the miracles the "genuine facts ?" "Miracles are, in themselves, extremely improbable things." Now, to my mind, nothing is more likely than that "our" biographies would invent the "extremely improbable things," and not the probable ones, since no necessity existed to invent these. The conclusion is now amazingly easy. Nothing is more natural than that the miracles of "our biographies" should be "inventions," while the other things are not. But the truth of Christianity rests on the miracles, and not on the other things ; in other words, the truth of Christianity rests on "inventions." It is, hence, false.

For a moment, grave reader, pause and reweigh the first sentence in the preceding paragraph. "Nothing is more natural than that exaggerations and even inventions should be mixed in our biographies with genuine facts." If nothing is more natural, hardly is anything more certain. Here, then, you are in effect told, with hardly the semblance of doubt, that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are a compound of "exaggerations," "inventions," and "genuine facts." What now is the character of the book in which this is found ? Is it for Christ, or against him ? Is it infidel, or the reverse ? An answer is idle.

But again in regard to miracles : "Between the astonishing design and its astonishing success there intervenes an astonishing instrumentality—that of miracles. It will be thought by some, that in as-

serting miracles to have been actually wrought by Christ we go beyond what the evidence, perhaps beyond what any possible evidence, is able to sustain. Waiving, then, for the present, the question whether miracles were actually wrought, we may state a fact which is fully capable of being established by ordinary evidence, and which is actually established by evidence as ample as any historical fact whatever—the fact, namely, that Christ *professed* to work miracles. We may go further, and assert with confidence that Christ was believed by his followers really to work miracles, and that it was mainly on this account that they conceded to him the pre-eminent dignity and authority which he claimed. The accounts we have of these miracles may be exaggerated; it is possible that in some special cases stories have been related which have no foundation whatever.”

Certainly no one except an infidel himself is likely to detect in *Ecce Homo* any wish to give to Christianity the influence of his ability and argument. The skill with which he guards his reluctant concessions, and neutralizes them by setting over against them bold countervailing assertions, precludes all fear of anything of the kind. “Perhaps,” “possibly,” “may be,” and the like, are oft-recurring words in his tale, and play a conspicuous part in the effort he makes to cloud the hallowed page. They make up much of the material out of which he weaves the veil with which to eclipse all that relieves the future of its gloom to poor sorrowing humanity. And when he does seem to concede us anything, immediately he subjoins a terrific “but,” or some other equally inauspicious disjunctive; and then follows the sedative to all the hopes he had flushed. Does he mean, in the preceding paragraph, actually and articulately to admit that Christ and the apostles wrought miracles? Resting on a single sentence, we would conclude he does; but at once follows the saving clause to infidelity, and our conclusion is felt to be a *non-sequitur*. Indeed, one striking peculiarity in *Ecce Homo* is, that while he appears to grant the very thing you want, he yet, at the same instant, suggests the precise fact, argument, or train of thought which the infidel needs in a successful reply. As an illustration let me repeat the following: “It will be thought by some that in asserting miracles to have been actually wrought by Christ, we go beyond what the evidence, *perhaps beyond what any possible evidence*, is able to sustain.” Now allow that *Ecce Homo* here means really to concede that Christ actually wrought miracles, what would constitute the most successful reply conceivable to his concessions? Simply that no possible evidence can sustain it. So that, if he really meant to concede anything, which I feel free to regard as doubtful, he conceded it merely that he might be afforded the opportunity of suggesting the most successful reply possible to it. Through courtesy he will grant the Christian’s request, but at the same time he must gratify the dominant feeling of his own

heart, by supplying his infidel friend with the means of rendering null all that his courtesy had led him to do.

All that Ecce Homo can affirm for us in a style admitting of no doubt is, that it is "actually established by evidence as ample as any historical fact whatever that Christ *professed* to work miracles." Nay more, Ecce Homo can "go further, and assert with confidence that Christ was believed by his followers really to work miracles." This is simply contemptible. Why did not Ecce Homo go still further, and tell us that he could say all this of Joe Smith and a hundred other arrant impostors since the days of Christ, with all the confidence with which he has glozed the preceding paltry assertion? Christ *professed* to work miracles, and the dupes who followed him *professed* to believe he did! Hypocrites *profess* to be honest men, and liars *profess* to speak the truth. This assertion, I boldly affirm, is "actually established by evidence as ample as any historical fact whatever."

But "the accounts we have of these miracles may be exaggerated; it is possible that in some special cases stories have been related which have no foundation whatever." Not that these accounts *are* exaggerated, only they *may be*. This is slippery. Again: not that "in some special cases stories *have been* related which have no foundation whatever;" certainly not, only "it is possible." But grant that these "accounts" are exaggerated, how much is exaggeration and how much not; and which are the exaggerated parts and which not? Surely we have to regret that Ecce Homo should have written merely a fragment, and that, consequently, he was not afforded space to amplify just here, illustrate, and cite particulars. We are curious to see these "accounts" analyzed, and the parts which are exaggerated separated from the parts which are not, and placed the one in bold antithesis over against the other. Could not some of the mimic Ecce Homos, who are at present lauding the book, undertake this task for us?

Ecce Homo has been eulogized, highly so, in this country, even by men who claim to be the friends of Christ, and deny that they are the enemies of the New Testament. In some instances their praises have been loud and unqualified; in others characterized by more caution. Suppose these men listened to me in a pretended defense of the New Testament, and that during my defense I said of the book: Some of its accounts of the miracles it records may be exaggerated; it is possible that in some special cases stories have been related which have no foundation whatever; in other words, they may be arrant lies. In what light would these men feel compelled to view me? Certainly not as the friend of the book, but as its real enemy, and seeking to rend its hold on the minds and hearts of men. Countless eulogies after this could not redeem me from the charge of being

the covert but determined enemy of the book ; and I myself should feel that a lifetime would be too short to enable me to make the apologies my conduct demanded. Had *Ecce Homo* not one other offensive passage in it, this one of itself would be enough to consign it to eternal infamy. All else in the book might be praise, still we should deem this praise as the kiss of Judas. It is the peculiarity of the infidelity of the day to admit the historic existence of Christ, and that the New Testament is partly true ; but at the same time to insist that the former was deceived and the latter not fully trustworthy. Thus over both deep shadows of doubt are dragged ; and while these remain, practical repudiation is the inevitable result.

That *Ecce Homo* means to make the impression on the mind of the reader that, provisionally at least, he grants the fact of some miracles, is certain. How sincerely this is done I shall not attempt to say. One thing, however, is to be much regretted,—that he did not tell us in what light he views the miracles of the New Testament. I feel profoundly convinced, that, although he seems to use the word miracle in its Christian sense, yet he is far from viewing miracles as Christians view them. With him, the miracles of the New Testament are nothing more than ordinary facts highly embellished by the Jewish imagination. All these facts *Ecce Homo* could explain so as to land them many leagues this side of the miraculous. As confirmation of what is here said, take his explanation of the events of Christ's baptism :

“Now the miracles of the baptism are not among those which are attested by strong external evidence. There is nothing necessarily miraculous in the appearance of the dove, and a peal of thunder might be shaped into intelligible words by the excited imagination of men accustomed to consider thunder as the voice of God.”

The Holy Spirit, then, did not descend on Christ at his baptism, though this is most formally and distinctly affirmed in the sacred narrative. Only a dove appeared. Thus goes one of the most important miracles in the New Testament. Neither did God say, “*This is my beloved Son.*” Not at all. This profoundly imposing recognition, which at once determined the supreme rank of Christ among divinely sent teachers, is merely the shape which a peal of thunder took. That is all. And so, of course, of the voice which was heard on the mount of transfiguration. It was nothing more than a peal of thunder shaped into intelligible words by the excited imagination of the apostles present. Hence, from the Father we have no recognition of Christ as his Son. The sacred narrative to that effect is simply a huge invention. Nothing more. The whole story is plainly an invention, vulgarly a lie. Such is the manner in which *Ecce Homo* can explain away the so-called miracles of the New Testament. From this sample, it is not difficult to divine the route he could make all the

others take. I write *Ecce Homo* down as an infamous hypocrisy. He would make us believe he takes the word miracle in our sense, while in heart he does no such thing. Back of all his dishonorable pretenses lurk the explanations which would bring all the miracles of Christ and the apostles down to the level of commonplace facts.

As further confirmation of what we have now said, and as still additional evidence of the unscrupulous facility with which *Ecce Homo* can raze the very foundation stones on which the Christian temple rests, we take an extract from his account of the temptation :

"From the time of his temptation Christ appeared as a worker of miracles. We are expressly told by St. John that he had wrought none before, but all our authorities concur in representing him as possessing and using the gift after this time. We are to conceive him, therefore, as becoming now, for the first time, conscious of miraculous powers. Now none of our biographies point this out, and yet it is visibly the key to the whole narration. What is called Christ's temptation, is the excitement of his mind, which was caused by the nascent consciousness of supernatural power." (Page 18.)

That *Ecce Homo* throughout his whole treatise degrades Christ to the level of a mere man is hardly to be doubted. He only views him as extraordinary in the same sense in which he would so view a great poet or gifted artist. Though great, astonishingly great, still he deems him great simply as a man. That Christ was in any part a divine being, in whom inhered, as underived, and inseparable from himself almighty creative power and infinite wisdom, are sublime facts utterly ignored in *Ecce Homo*. And although here and there may be found an expression seemingly designed to exalt him, yet these are in all cases to be taken as modified by those meant to lower him. As proof, I recite the following : "We are to conceive him, therefore, as becoming now, for the first time, conscious of miraculous power." Did he possess "miraculous power" before his temptation? If so, he had not been conscious of it. Then, clearly, he had never used it. Thus is made to result the falsification of so much of the sacred record as represents him as creating, before his incarnation, all things that are made. Again : "we are to conceive him as becoming now, for the first time, conscious of miraculous power." Did he, then, possess it before this time? Suppose we grant he did. Still he was unconscious of the fact. He then, by courtesy, had the power, but did not know it. Thus his knowledge, even of himself, to say nothing of other things, is impeached. He was hence not the divine all-knowing Word the Scriptures make him. He was simply a man uncommonly endowed. Such is the Christ of *Ecce Homo*. Just as far is he below the Christ of the New Testament as is the feeble spark of the fitful fire-fly below the orb of day in his meridian splendor.

But "what is called Christ's temptation is the excitement of his

mind which was caused by the nascent consciousness of supernatural power." Thus, in one unblushing sentence, a whole page of Holy Writ is set aside as false. Christ, then, was not led out by the Holy Spirit into the wilderness. Of course not. This is merely one of the "exaggerations," or it may be one of the "inventions," with which our "biographies" abound. Neither was he ever tempted by the Devil. Indeed, from *Ecce Homo*, it may well be doubted whether there be a Devil. I much incline to think that with him that august and dreadful being is an innocent myth. Sure it is that he and Christ never literally met, indeed, never met in any sense, the one to try his vast power on the other to induce him to sin. Hence, when it is said that Christ fasted forty days and forty nights, this is to be set down as a pious "exaggeration." And when we are told that at the end of this time the Devil came to him, this we are to consider merely as a piece of "mental excitement caused by the nascent consciousness of supernatural power." Thus the whole of the temptation, one of the most astounding and intricate miracles which the New Testament records, is so explained as to become a tame, commonplace event. Had *Ecce Homo* furnished us with an explanation of all the other miracles the sacred volume records, that they would thereby have been reduced to a level with the scenes of the baptism and those of the temptation can hardly admit of a doubt. His studied object is to erase out of the popular mind all faith in the Christian miracles. To do this, one of the most successful methods that could possibly be adopted is to select one or two of the most striking of these miracles and to show that they are susceptible of a most easy and natural explanation; that they contain, in fact, not even a vestige of the truly miraculous; that, indeed, they are simply "inventions" of men "accustomed to view thunder as the voice of God;" and after this say nothing at all of the other miracles. The work is now done. All else can be safely left with the reader. His mind is now supplied with a method, a hint, a model; and surely he will not neglect to make the proper use of these. Unquestionably he will reason thus: Here, now, are two miracles most satisfactorily explained. They are simply "inventions." This is clear. Now that *Ecce Homo* could have explained all the other miracles quite as successfully as he has these, there is no doubt. Miracles are "inventions." They shall never dupe me. With this the reader can be safely left to himself. I shall certainly credit *Ecce Homo* with displaying no ordinary cunning in the manner he adopts to set aside miracles. Arouse suspicion in a man's mind in regard to the reality of the Christian miracles; then show him how one miracle can be explained away, then how another can be; furnish him a plan, a sample; artfully throw in the words "invention," "exaggeration;" talk of "excited imaginations;" scatter a few hints implying superstition; mention the fact that miracle-workers are "accustomed to

view thunder as the voice of God ;"—you are not likely to fail of your effect. Such is the plan of *Ecce Homo*. Beyond doubt it is well adapted to work injury, especially with those whose minds are a little bent to infidelity. With the sturdy believer it can do no mischief ; but, unfortunately, these are not a majority, even in so-called Christian lands. That the book should ever have been the subject of a eulogy, or even of an ambiguous notice, at the hands of any man calling himself a Christian, is to me an insoluble mystery. Yet we know that such has been the case. Indeed, I have been astounded to read the complimentary notices of some, and the non-committal ones of others. To see brethren deliberately blinding themselves to the subtle poison of a dangerous book, and passing it uncondemned into the hands of youth, gives exquisite pain. But to comment thus is not my purpose.

The two grand pillars on which the Christian superstructure rests are unquestionably miracles and prophecy. Destroy these, and Christianity can never be sustained. We have seen how *Ecce Homo* deals with miracles. It is now in place to let the reader see how he deals with prophecy. On this point the following extracts shall suffice :

"It was the glory of John the Baptist to have successfully revived the function of the prophet. For several centuries the function had remained in abeyance. It had become a remote, though it was still a fondly cherished, tradition, that there had been a time when the nation had received guidance from commissioned representatives of its invisible King. * * * But prophecy was one of those gifts which, like poetry or high art, are particularly apt to die out under change of times. *Several centuries had succeeded each other which were alike incapable of producing it.*" I here put in italics the utterance to which the reader's attention is especially invited.

Again : "John the Baptist defied all the opposition of those scribes who in the long silence of the prophetic inspiration had become the teachers of the nation, and who resisted him with the conservatism of lawyers united to the bigotry of priests. He made his way back to the hidden fountains, and received at last that national acknowledgment which silenced even these professional jealousies, *that irresistible voice of the people in which the Jew was accustomed to hear the voice of God.*" (Italics mine.)

That prophecy, as a gift, stands with *Ecce Homo* on a perfect level with the gift of poetry and high art, can not, in the light of the foregoing, be held as questionable. Indeed, with him there is no such thing as prophecy in the Christian sense of the term ; that is, as implying that God sends the Holy Spirit into certain men, to give them knowledge of the future, and guide them in speaking thereof. With *Ecce Homo* prophecy is simply a natural gift, a gift, however, of a very high order, endowing its possessor with rare sagacity in fore-

seeing and foretelling the future, but wholly destitute of every trait of the truly miraculous. It is hence subject to all the laws and whims which govern the gifts of poetry and art. With him, if a century is capable of producing prophecy, it exists ; if not, it exists not. God makes not the prophet, with him. He is the child of nature, not of God ; the product of a fertile age, not the mouth-organ of the Holy Spirit. Such clearly is prophecy with Ecce Homo. But this with the Christian man is no prophecy at all. Rather it is the sly subversion of all prophecy, and this is what its author designed it to be.

Once more : take the last sentence in the second of the two preceding extracts, John at last received the national acknowledgment, "*that irresistible voice of the people in which the Jew was accustomed to hear the voice of God.*" In the prophet, then, the voice of God was really not heard. Through him God never spoke. In him the voice of the people only was heard. The pretense, then, of the prophet, that God had delivered to him certain great lessons and that he was divinely commissioned to deliver these to the nation, was simply a pretense. It was not true ; it was an "invention." For it there existed no foundation whatever outside of the excited imagination of men who were accustomed to account thunder and the shout of the multitude as the voice of God. Hence those sublime utterances of the Old Testament, which we are accustomed to call prophecies and to regard as emanating from the mind of the almighty Father, stand only on a par with the lines of Dante, and have, in fact, no more binding force on the lives and consciences of men than the epics of Milton. Such is prophecy with Ecce Homo.

It will be observed by the reader that I am having no argument with Ecce Homo. This was not proposed in the present article. What I aim at is simply to enable the reader to see the true character and design of the work. To do this it is only necessary to adduce and analyze a few paragraphs. It is Ecce Homo's manner, rather than his matter, which I think so well calculated to do mischief. What this is is easily shown. To argue with him the issues he raises is to rediscuss questions settled long since, and a hundred times, to the entire satisfaction of the Christian. It is, hence, deemed wholly unnecessary to reconsider them now.

The objectionable features of Ecce Homo are far more numerous than its pages. To point all these out is impossible in the short space of a single essay. Still I must not close this paper without presenting, if my space will permit, one or two more extracts from the work. The following is rather long, still I desire to insert it : "Present to an ordinary man the maxim, 'Love your enemies ;' you may hear him sigh as he answers that the saying is divine, but he fears he shall never practice it. The reason is, that he has an enemy, and fully understands what it is to love him, and also what it is to

hate him. Present to the same man the saying, 'The word was made flesh,' and what will he answer? If he answered the truth, he would say that he did not understand it; but he would not be quite an ordinary man if he could recognize his own ignorance so plainly. He will answer that he *believes* it, by which he means that as the words make no impression whatever upon his mind, so they excite no opposition in it. Present the same two texts to a thinker. It is not impossible that the first may seem to him no hard saying; he may have no enemies, or his thoughtful habits may have brought his passions under control. But the second will overwhelm him with difficulty. For he knows what it asserts; he may have been accustomed to regard the *lógos* as the technicality of an extinct philosophy, and may be staggered to find it thus imported into history, and made the groundwork of what aspires to be a permanent theology. It is at this point, then, that the thinker will sigh, and you will hear him murmur that it is a great saying, but he fears he shall never believe it."

Ecce Homo here distributes the human family into two classes, the ordinary men and the thinkers. Having done this, he then proceeds very adroitly to show us what disposition these classes are under the necessity of making of the doctrines and precepts of Christ. The ordinary man perfectly understands the precept, Love your enemies, admits it to be divine, but fears he shall never practice it. Now what Ecce Homo here implies, not says, the impression, in other words, which he clearly means to leave on the mind is, that such is the nature of the precept that it is not in the power of ordinary men to obey it. Thus Christ is impliedly charged with enjoining on men what they are not able to do. From this the inference is easy; he is a cruel master and should not be heeded. As to the doctrine, The Word was made flesh, the ordinary man, unless he lies, will admit he does not understand it. True, he will answer "that he *believes* it;" but then by this "he means that as the words make no impression whatever upon his mind, so they excite no opposition in it." When, then, he says he believes the doctrine, he not only asserts what is false, but what, in his case, can not be true. The words make no impression whatever upon his mind; hence, in no true sense conceivable can he be allowed to believe them. Thus go the difficulties of Christianity with the ordinary man.

But with the thinker the case is slightly different. He sees no insuperable difficulties in the precept, "Love your enemies;" but then the reason is, either that he has no enemies, or, what amounts to the same thing, no hate which he can not control. His difficulties, therefore, are not found here. But present to him the doctrine, "The Word was made flesh." This "*overwhelms him with difficulty.*" Here he "sighs," and "murmurs," "it is a great saying," but I "fear I shall never believe it." That is, according to Ecce Homo, such are the difficulties

in the doctrine that they overwhelm the thinker, and hence render his belief of it impossible. Only the ordinary man can *say* he believes it, and then he lies. Consequently, the doctrine stands upon the sacred page as in fact unbelieved by any mortal man. Thus is made to pass from human hearts all that can be called faith in the sublime truths of the Christian religion. When we say, as Christians, we know by experience that we can love our enemies, we are simply deluded. Such is not the case. When before God we affirm that we do believe with our whole heart that the Word was made flesh, we are wholly mistaken. All that can be truly said of us is, that since these words make no impression whatever upon our minds, so they excite no opposition in them. Plainly and finally, some of the precepts, at least, of Christ we can not obey ; some of his doctrines we can not believe. Hence to us Christianity is, in its highest and most important features, an impossible religion. Divine, therefore, it can not be, else it would have been intelligible ; humane it can not be, else it would have been practicable. By the ordinary man it is unpracticed ; and both by the ordinary man and the thinker unbelieved. To whom, then, can it be acceptable ; rather, by whom can it be accepted ? It ought to be rejected, it must be rejected. Such, clearly, according to *Ecce Homo*, is the end to which Christianity is and ought to be doomed.

We have now seen what disposition *Ecce Homo* makes of prophecy, what of miracles, what of some of the doctrines, what of some of the precepts of Christ. Let us next see how only, according to him, the New Testament can at the present time be interpreted. With this we may close this article. The following is his language :

“Suppose this difficulty surmounted, still the same remoteness of the life of Christ creates much difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of the words he used, and the exact nature of the doctrines he taught. For those words and those doctrines have been subjected to the ingenuity of many generations of commentators. Spoken originally to men of the ancient world, they have received a succession of medieval and modern glosses, and if we put these aside and study the text for ourselves, our own training, the education and habits of the nineteenth century, disqualify us in a considerable degree for entering into its meaning. Only a well-trained historical imagination, active and yet calm, is competent so to revive the circumstances of place and time in which the words were delivered as to draw from them, at a distance of eighteen hundred years, a meaning tolerably like that which they conveyed to those who heard them.”

Really, then, according to this, we have, at the present day, no very trustworthy guarantee that we know either what Christ commanded or what he taught. There is “much difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of the words he used.” Through this much difficulty

most persons, no doubt, must fail. "Only a well-trained historical imagination is now competent to draw from the words a meaning *tolerably like* that which they conveyed to those who heard them." But very few persons are endowed with a well-trained historical imagination, active and yet calm. Hence but very few persons can draw any meaning whatever from these words; and even the meaning which these draw who are so endowed is only tolerably like the true meaning. Hence all is doubt, all uncertainty. Christ may have taught, or he may not, that he was the Word made flesh; or this great truth may be only tolerably like the original. Perhaps it is hardly even tolerably like it; for this doctrine has been subjected to the ingenuity of many generations of commentators; it has received a succession of medieval and modern glosses which darken it very much; and many adverse circumstances disqualify us for investigating it. Even the thinker must sigh, and murmur, and say: It is a great saying, but I fear I shall never believe it. Such is all we now have of the meaning of Christ's words. He, of course, never inspired his apostles to write down his meaning in words so simple and so intelligible, that human ingenuity and human glosses can have but little effect in obscuring them; he has never committed the curatorship of these words to a church most vigilant and intensely jealous of their import; neither has he the power to guard by his providence the words he left on earth to save men. Certainly not; these are merely the crudities of men who are not thinkers.

So far as we have now examined *Ecce Homo*, it yields the following conclusions: Miracles are in themselves extremely improbable things, and those of the New Testament admit of an explanation as mere natural events; prophecy is but a high natural gift, and is of the same nature with the gifts of poetry and art; the doctrines of Christ, to the thinker, are beset with overwhelming difficulty, he can not believe them; the precepts of Christ, to the ordinary man, are, it is true, divine, but he can not obey them; while the words of Christ, containing his doctrines and laws, can be made to yield to the present age a meaning only tolerably like their original meaning. Let now the reader subtract from Christianity its foundation of miracles, its prophecies, its most important doctrines and precepts, and all reliable meaning from its words, and he has left what, in the judgment of *Ecce Homo*, may be held without disgrace by the thinker and without hypocrisy by the ordinary man. With this we take leave of the infamous book.

THOUGH we may sometimes think our lot is hard and life hardly worth possessing, though the world may look dark and cold, and all nature seem to frown, we will still be cheered by the hope that the cloud may soon pass away and the silver lining be revealed.

SCRIPTURE TYPES—No. 4.

WE hope enough has been said in our last to satisfy the most skeptical that in developing scriptures we are not dealing in myths and fancies, but that there is a real *terra firma* in the Old Testament on which we may stand securely, and with the telescope of faith take in a grand view of God's religious sphere, studded with whole constellations of stars, some nearer, some more remote, some larger, some smaller; some primaries, others secondaries, but all commingling their rays to add brightness to the rising star of Bethlehem.

Types, prophecy, and miracle are three great chapters of internal evidence which the Scriptures offer for the confirmation of our faith, and to him who closely studies it the first is by no means the least interesting or important. We have seen how Christ's headship is typified in Adam, the generative centre of the race; and if we take Paul as our guide, we can not go astray in following up the points of similarity and contrast between the first and second Adams which make the former one of the most expressive types of the latter that can be found in all the revelation of God.

But the whole character, relation, and work of Christ are so many sided, that we are not able to comprehend them in our present imperfect state. So finite are our faculties, and so limited the field of their exercise that, even admitting we have in number all that are necessary to take in impressions of Christ in his whole nature and perfections, these impressions must necessarily be faint and deficient.

The spirit of truth that inspired the minds of the apostles, and took of the things of Jesus and showed them to those faithful men and through them to the church and the world, has exhausted the resources of nature for imagery to adequately portray the moral grandeur of Christ as our sacrifice, mediator, and redeemer. No one familiar with the writings of Paul and John can have failed to notice how often, when speaking of our Lord, though elevated on alpine summits of observation, they seem at a loss for language sufficiently comprehensive to set forth their conceptions of the grandeur and glory of him "who was made higher than the heavens"—"who walks in the midst of the seven candlesticks, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the breasts with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes as a flame of fire; his feet like fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace, and his voice as the sound of many waters, who holds in his hand seven stars, and out of whose mouth goes the sharp two-edged sword, and whose countenance is as the sun shining in his strength."

Is it any wonder, then, that to stereotype this many-sided relation of our Redeemer to the church and the world, we should have as typical persons men like Adam, Abel, Noah, Melchizedek, Isaac, Moses, Joshua, David, Jonah, and a host of others among the patriarchs, prophets, warriors, kings, priests, and deliverers, who with holy heroism wrought righteousness and subdued kingdoms, even as he has done and is now doing, whose servants they were, for whom they lived and labored and suffered on earth, and with whom they shall reign in heaven when shadow and image shall have been lost in the enduring reality of God's government over sinless angels and redeemed men forever.

Let us pick out a few of these from the long list of Old Testament saints and worthies, whose lives and sufferings and triumphs prefigure the like things in our Messiah. There is, in the infancy of time, Abel, the first martyr persecuted and slain for his faith in God. He stands at the head of the noble company of the martyrs, the first of whom we have any account that they offered sacrifice; the first to taste the bitterness of death; the first to enter the house appointed for all living. His blood cried for vengeance, and the cry entered the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. The persecutor is brought to punishment and goes forth a wanderer and a vagabond, with the curse of God on his brow and a brother's blood on his conscience. Henceforth the persecuted and the persecutor find their types in these two brothers; but not till we see Him whose blood speaks better things than the blood of Abel lying a bleeding victim, and the Cains that slew him driven forth to wander under the curse of God, a by-word and a hissing among the nations, do we comprehend the full significance of these impressive types.

Then there is Melchizedek to prefigure the priestly character of the Son of God. What a remarkable personage is he in the light of a few passages of Scripture! "And Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine (mark that), and he was the priest of the most high God; and he blessed him, and said: Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thine hand, and he gave him tithes of all." (Gen. xiv., 18.) Again: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent; thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek." (Psalm cx., 4.) This last passage is quoted by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews no less than three times in the fifth and sixth chapters of that epistle, and in the seventh he breaks out into one of the most eloquent descriptions of Christ's priesthood compared with that of Melchizedek, in the relation of type and antitype, that can possibly be conceived.

We can here only glance at a few prominent items in the chapter. Who Melchizedek was, we have no certain means of knowing; for it

must be borne in mind that this name is official rather than personal, meaning king of righteousness. The supposition of many is that he was Shem, the son of Noah of that name ; and this appears to be a very reasonable conclusion in view of all we have seen written on this subject. But whoever he was, we may gather from what is said of him in the passages quoted, the following particulars : He was a remarkable person, a type of Christ, lived two thousand years before the Christian era, and united in himself both the regal and sacerdotal functions—he was king of Salem, as well as priest of the most high God.

In the patriarchal age the head of each family was its priest by a divine right, but Melchizedek stands out rather as a high-priest, and as such he is related to our high-priest ; for mark, Christ is not simply a priest, but he is “the high-priest of our profession.” The epistle to the Hebrews was written to prove the superiority of the new over the old economy. This is the central issue, and it gives shape and color to everything said in it. Now, in carrying out his design, the apostle shows that our priesthood is after a better order than that of the Jews ; ours is after Melchizedek, theirs after Aaron ; ours, therefore, antedates theirs nearly five hundred years, and was before the law, in which they gloried. The former is a royal priesthood, the latter is not. Melchizedek blessed Abraham, and hence was greater than Abraham, for “the less is blessed of the greater.” But Abraham was confessedly greater than Aaron, and therefore the prototype of our priesthood is clearly greater than the great high-priest of the Jewish nation. Not only so, but Aaron paid tithes to Melchizedek in Abraham, “for he was yet in the loins of his progenitor” when the priest met the patriarch returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him, and received a tenth of all.

This high-priest of the patriarchal age, as such, had no pedigree ; we know not who were his father and mother ; we know not the beginning of his days nor the end of his life. His descent is not given. The Scriptures are as silent as the grave on all these points, and purposely so. To fulfill the requirements of a most significant type, this illustrious man was, then, “without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life ; but made like unto the Son of God ; abideth a priest continually.” As Melchizedek was the only priest of his order having neither predecessor nor successor, so Christ is the only priest in Christianity. As this thought is fundamental, and ignorance of it the root of one of the most pernicious errors of modern times, the reader will bear with us while we develop it.

A Christian minister is in no correct sense a priest, for the radical idea in this word, as used in the word of God, is one who offers sacrifice. This all did who are called priests in the Bible, whether those

among the Jews officiating at the tabernacle or temple, or those among the Gentiles at the shrines of false divinities, such as the priests of Apollo, Mars, or Jupiter. A sacrificing priest was called in Greek *Hierus*, which word is never given in the gospel but to Him who, by the one offering of himself, forever perfected the sanctified. The office of a Christian presbyter is not to sacrifice, but to teach ; not to pray instead of the worshiper, but to instruct him to pray for himself.

The only perfect sacrifice ever offered being made when Christ expired on the cross, it was the last ever offered by divine approbation ; it put an end to all literal sacrifices, and when he ascended to heaven, to present in the holy of holies his own blood, he fulfilled the type, and removed forever the whole sacrificial system that had obtained for four thousand years. There is not a priest now on the earth that is not a rebel in the sight of God, a usurper of the prerogative of the Savior of men. The necessity for priests and their offices has alike passed away, and it is blasphemy to apply the name to a minister of Jesus Christ. Those who wear it and love it are children of the scarlet lady, the mother of apostasies and apostates, being full of pride, ambition, and lordly arrogance ; they have left the simple duties of a Christian evangelist, which is to instruct, comfort, and guide the flock to Christ, our only High-priest, and his one perfect sacrifice, for the wealth, power, and honor that flow from a people too ignorant or too weak to rebuke their pagan usurpations. There is, in a word, no hierarchy among Christians, only as all alike are constituted kings and priests to God by Him whose blood cleanses from all sin.

How comforting, then, to our faith to find this unity of Christ's priesthood exemplified in type by Melchizedek four thousand years ago, and one of the most pernicious errors of modern times cut up by the roots by the teaching of this case !

Again : Melchizedek did not, like Aaron, officiate for one people ; he stood before God for the race, for all who came to him for his ministrations. So Christ offers his sacrifice for all who will come to God through him. He takes away the sin of the world. If this be the case, how poor and mean appears the partial, selfish, and miserable system of Calvin ! Were we dependent on the Aaronic system alone for our ideas of Christ's office, there might be found some apology for the wretched theology that makes our Savior offer himself for an elect few, and some of these the poorest specimens of either Christians or sinners we have ever seen. No ; he is the priest, and his sacrifice was made for his church ; but, then, all who hear may come and enter his church. The offer is as wide as the ruin of humanity and as tender as his bleeding heart. Our Melchizedek has a universal priesthood, and all may come to his atonement who feel its need and will accept its benefit.

As the typical priesthood of this grand order was never abolished, as he abides a priest forever, so our Anointed, the antitype, is an eternal high-priest ; death does not come to end his generous ministrations on our behalf. He was made a priest according to the power of an endless life. "He ever lives to intercede for us." This is, or ought to be, our comfort. We shall soon die, but our tender and merciful High-priest ever lives, and will reappear at the end of the world without a sin-offering to the salvation of his people.

He is also a royal priest ; this was not Aaron. He wears a crown as well as a mitre, a sceptre as well as a crosier. He unites in himself all royal dignities and glory, and all holy and pure affection. His kingly mien is tempered with condescension and kindness. He sits upon a throne which has been sanctified with blood. His palace is also a temple, and while we honor him as our sovereign, we worship him as our Savior. Language fails to express the admirable adaptation of Christ's offices and work to all our wretched necessities — his sympathy with us in all our heart-broken sorrows.

Melchizedek brought forth bread and wine, gave to Abraham, and blessed him ; and at the mention of these does not every Christian heart turn instinctively to the feast where Jesus alone presides, and refreshes his weary ones in the battles of life, returning with the honors of victory from hard-fought fields ! He does, indeed, give us bread and wine and blesses us. Who but he has the bread of life ? Who but he, the wine of refreshment and the oil of joy ? The ancients always made a feast on sacrifice, and so we must understand this meeting of Melchizedek and Abraham, and so we in breaking bread with our Lord and one another, are making a feast on sacrifice.

If the reader is not wearied, and has not before, let him now read the 7th chapter of Hebrews ; let him give himself to calm reflection, to deep meditation on that masterly vindication of Christ's priesthood as superior to the Aaronic and the antitype of that of Melchizedek, and if we need an apology for our apparent enthusiasm in treating of the things of the gospel in the light of Scripture typology, he will be able to plead one for us. We never knew what force internal evidence had, what beauty the Bible possessed, and what delight its study afforded, till we gave ourself to an investigation of Old Testament types.

We can devote only a few paragraphs to speak of him who said : "A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, like unto me ; unto him shall ye hearken, and it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall not hearken to that prophet shall be cut off from among the people." Like unto me ! And how many and how strong the points of resemblance ! In whatever point of view we look at Moses and Jesus, we shall find numerous interesting coincidences which constitute the former an instructive type of the latter.

In one prominent circumstance connected with their birth there is a strong resemblance. Moses is born under the reign of a tyrant who aims at the extermination of all male children born of Jewish parents in his dominion. Moses is spared by the special care of Heaven working through secondary agencies and instrumentalities, little observed by those cruel oppressors, whose empire was to be shaken and finally overthrown by causes cradled in the little ark that bore him on the turbid waters of the Nile. The hand of God is visibly manifested in the preservation of this great redeemer of an oppressed and suffering people.

Fifteen centuries afterward he who was to be like unto Moses is born under the sway of another Pharaoh. Herod conformed in disposition and action to his infamous prototype, even as Jesus to the law-giver of the Hebrews. He, too, seeks to compass the destruction of a redeemer, by issuing a cruel edict that all the male children under two years of age should be slain. Rachels again weep as they wept on the banks of the Nile, and refuse to be comforted because their sons are not. But the God of Moses is the Father of Jesus, and he thwarts the designs of this tyrant, just as he did those of the other. The two redeemers, one of Israel after the flesh, the other of Israel after the spirit, are the objects of God's special care, and are preserved in infancy from similar dangers.

In character Moses also displays the same admirable traits that appear in Christ. He was the meekest of men, most unselfish, a man of single purpose, zealous for God's honor, and devoted to his service. As far as a mortal could, in qualities of mind and heart, be a type of Him who was holy, harmless, and undefiled, Moses fulfilled all the requirements of a perfect type; and in a life singularly unique and eventful foreshadows the life and disposition of Him who came to be the light of the world and to finish what Moses began. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

But it is in their official relations, and chiefly as great deliverers, that the most pleasing features of their likeness appear. This will be seen when we come to speak of the deliverance wrought by each.

Surely the unity of the Bible and its divine origin, its being worthy of God, and suited to the wants of our intelligence are seen in its types and antitypes.

No. 5.

HAVING delayed as long as we deem profitable, in view of the limits assigned ourself in these papers upon typical persons, but without supposing for a moment that we have exhausted the theme, we pass in this number to the consideration of those ordinances which in former dispensations plainly had a typical character. And here we can be at no loss, for on every hand in the worship of the Israelites we dis-

cover divine appointments that can be regarded as worthy of God only on the ground that they were designed to be but temporary and adumbrative until the coming of the Just One, and until the establishment of his kingdom should introduce us to that which is perfect and enduring.

To rightly apprehend the nature of the three great dispensations of revealed religion, and the relation existing among them, we should keep constantly in mind a distinction we pointed out in our first article, between the *tupos* and the *telos* of each. But, perhaps, to the ordinary reader the meaning of these two Greek words is not sufficiently clear. Observe, then, that the first is the type or model according to which God has constructed the things of both nature and religion. This type, pattern, or model is found in all God's systems of religious administration. In its nature it is unchangeable and enduring, and this affords us a sufficient ground for analogical reasoning in reference to revealed religion.

The astronomer, by observing the orbits of known planets, and finding them to be elliptical, concludes that those he has not examined are elliptical also, and so uniform has God been in building this outer court of his great temple, that no exception has yet been found, and we hence conclude it to be a law. It has been verified as such a thousand times since Kepler first published it to the scientific world.

Again : the naturalist has observed that animals that have horns on the skull are ruminant, that is, chew the cud ; that these in the Creator's great plan invariably go together ; there is no exception known to us—the rhinoceros, with his horn on his nose, may seem so to the careless observer—but it is not, and does not even approach to one in the eye of the man of science. Now here we have a *tupos* or type in the proper sense of the word, the sense in which we use it in these articles. Show the head of an animal long since extinct to any naturalist, and if it have horns on the skull he will tell you the animal was in its day a ruminant, that it had more than one stomach, and that it had the common properties of all ruminant animals. This will be an assured conviction ; the induction has been extensive, and he has no doubt of his conclusion. So far has the science of natural history gone in this direction, that if you gave to the great Cuvier a single bone of any extinct species of animal he would construct the whole animal with tolerable accuracy. Show a geologist a single tooth that has lain in the earth for indefinite ages and has become a fossil, and he will describe the animal to which it must have belonged, though we have no examples of the species now living.

We have extended this illustration far enough for our purpose ; we might give a thousand more, but we do not think it would add anything to our assurance that in nature the Creator has well-defined types, and that things and persons are constructed, so to speak, according

to them. It is this fact that forms the ground for all inductive analogical reasoning ; it is the basis of all classification, without which we could not reason at all. Neither, indeed, could we have a single law of nature, for the classified facts of nature are her laws, and it is the conformity of facts to a common *tupos* or type that enables us to arrange the facts into classes.

But we can, by this principle, look into the future as well as the present and past with considerable certainty. From careful observation of God's work, and his dealings with his creatures in the past in nature—the picture to the eye, or in revelation—the word for the ear, we may conjecture, nay, we may prophesy, what will be in the future. I venture to assert my deep-seated conviction, and I hope my reader sympathizes with me in this, that God never did and never will make a planet in this or any other system to revolve in any other than an elliptical orbit ; that he never has and never will make a horned animal that is not ruminant. And it is worth while to observe here, that no reason has yet been given for this curious fact. We do not know the connection between the possession of horns and rumination ; we may never know it. There is the fact ; that we know. God may or he may not reveal the reason of the fact in the world to come, in the creation of future systems, when we, the reader and I, thank God, shall be morning stars that shall sing together, or sons of God that shall shout for joy.

So much for the *tupos*. Now let us, for a moment, look at the *telos*, or end of each part, individual, or system in the creation of God. There is not an animal, a plant, or a planet, that is not adapted in its whole constitution, being, and nature to the special system of which it is a part. There never has been ; there never will be such. All have their special adaptation to the age in which they live ; to the system to which they belong. Of course, we speak of classes and orders here. It is true, we now and then meet a *lapsus naturæ*, but these are abnormal, exceptional, and not to be taken into the account. And even what appears to us exceptional is, doubtless, but an instance of a higher and more general law, of which we are as yet ignorant.

Now what is true universally in the work of God in nature, is just as true in his gracious provisions for our redemption. Men in every age, from Plato to Emanuel Swedenborg, and, indeed, before and since the times of those great men, have been struggling after a realization of the thought that what we see, the phenomenal in nature and religion, are but the antitypes of divine ideas which must ever have existed in the eternal Mind. The fault with these profound men has been, that, leaving the path of revelation, they have been lured by far-reaching prospects and charming vistas, enchanting scenes, and the music of water-falls, to wander into the mazes of forbidden speculation. Not that all speculation is wrong. As long as we keep

within the bounds of revelation, the more we speculate the better. The wonders and glories of religion are well calculated to lead us to deep speculation. There will always be room for the exercise of this propension of our rational nature in seeking out what is obscure, and in interpreting the meaning of types and prophecies that go so far to confirm our faith, and enlarge our hope of the future state. Whoever has entered on his birthright as a man will think, and happy is he who can think, deeply on the word and works of God ; but let his thoughts be guided by revelation, and imbued with its spirit, and then the more we have of it, other things being equal, the more interest in and love for the things of the spirit we shall see in the hearts and lives of professed Christians.

We can not think deeply on the wonderful problems of sin and redemption, and not speculate, philosophize, conjecture ; it is not possible, and not desirable if it were. I have often been scandalized at much of what is said by brethren about philosophy and speculation, as if these were to be ignored altogether in religion. Not at all. It is our improper methods of speculation, our speculating on forbidden subjects, and especially our making a wrong use of our speculations, that do so much mischief. What Paul condemns as spurious philosophy is a very different thing from what we here speak of. The last result of speculation is *opinion*, and it is only when we substitute this for the *faith* of Christ, and require our brethren to receive the former as a bond of union, that we become heresiarchs. Whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ, and obeys him according to his word, is my brother ; and he may speculate as much as he chooses, provided he do not force his speculations on me. I am at liberty to choose or reject, as may suit my taste or inclination. Anything may be abused, and the abuse often drives good men from the lawful use of what is in itself desirable. Thus much was due to be said here, for fear of misunderstanding.

It is clear to the simplest mind that there are revealed in the word of God three great institutions, properly enough called the Patriarchal, Jewish, and the Christian. Each of these has its own gospel, ordinances, and laws, just as each has its own centre, priesthood, mediators, deliverers, and its own system of rewards and punishments. All these have a general character, and, besides, are nicely adjusted to a special end. They are adapted to the wants and genius of the age and people for which they were instituted.

In nature we have the shadow, the image, and the substance ; the first, indistinct and transient ; the second, more distinct, instructive, and pleasing ; the last, real, satisfying, and enduring. In the Old Testament we see the shadow of good things to come ; in the New Testament we have the image of the things ; but in heaven we shall enjoy the things themselves. We have in this world only the patterns

of things in the heavens, and by means of these God is as surely qualifying us for our heavenly inheritance and the everlasting realities of his kingdom and worship as ever he did the seed of Abraham thousands of years ago, for the bringing in of a better hope. While our Lord was here on earth, he was the image of the invisible God, and the good men of former dispensations were shadows of him ; as the shadow nearing the image, and the image the reality, become more distinct, so it is here. The patriarchs worshiped afar off, and saluted at a distance the promises of God ; some of them saw the glory of Christ, the Coming One, as he was called ; but it was dimly in type and outline. The image of God to us was but a shadow to them, but even that was a cause of great rejoicing. They were willing to suffer the reproach of Christ rather than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, or to inherit the wealth or crowns of mighty kingdoms. They preferred to be pilgrims and strangers in the earth, that they might obtain everlasting citizenship in the city of foundations, whose architect and ruler is God.

Abel saw a bleeding lamb, and all after him, till the Baptist, had but faint conceptions of the meaning of all that sacrificial blood of lambs slain day by day and offered at the altars of the false religion and the true ; “they could not see to the end of that which is abolished.” It remained for John to point to God’s Lamb, in contrast with those lambs of men that could not take away the sin of the world. But even he who had no superior of woman born, save the Lamb to whom he bore witness, knew but little compared with the least in the kingdom of heaven, and surely the greatest in the kingdom of heaven knows little, very little, in comparison with what shall hereafter be revealed in us. Thus progress, growth, development, are the law of God’s spiritual kingdom not less certainly than it is in nature. We have infancy, youth, and manhood in the individual ; we have the world, the church, and heaven, as the Jews had an outer court, a holy place, and a most holy, forming the tabernacle in the desert and the temple at Jerusalem.

To Christians there are made known on earth a hades and a heaven, and, as belonging to each of these, a trinity of solemn and mysterious import. The family, the state, and the church are for earth ; the beast, the dragon, and the false prophet are the trinity of hell ; while heaven has its blessed trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

These illustrations, which the reflective reader can extend in proportion to his knowledge of nature and the word of God, will prepare him to accept, without a murmur, our division of God’s great work of redemption into three grand institutions, at the head of which stand respectively, Adam, Moses, and Christ.

Man is not more surely composed of a body, a soul, and a spirit, and these do not more surely exhaust his whole constitution, than is

God's system of grace made up of the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations, suited to humanity in its infancy, its youth, and its maturity ; and as we can see nothing more glorious or more like the God-head than manhood developed in harmony with the laws of his body, soul, and spirit, so we may not expect any new development to supersede the work of the perfect man, Christ Jesus, in the gospel of his grace. If a man be not saved from sin and death by the gospel and its ordinances in this third and last dispensation of God's religion, it is vain to look for another. This is the dispensation of the Spirit, and there is reason for saying, that though a man may sin against God and his Son, and be forgiven, if he maligns the work of the Holy Spirit there is forgiveness for him neither in this world nor in that which is to come. There is no power in heaven, earth, or hell, to save him, if he reject the testimonies of this last divine agency in the work of reconciliation, and if Christians fall away from the heavenly gift, the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, to renew them again to repentance is not possible, Paul being judge.

The ordinances of religion in every age connect themselves chiefly with the elements, blood, water, oil, bread and wine ; if these do not embrace all, they are the chief, and to these we devote a brief space.

Atonement, purification, sanctification and communion are the ends accomplished instrumentally in all the divine economies by the use of these elements. Blood makes atonement, water cleanses, oil consecrates, and bread and wine support life, by bringing us into communion with the source of all life and blessedness. But in the type these were predicated of things as well as of persons ; in the antitype the latter only are the subjects of atonement, purification, consecration, and fellowship. It may be well enough for Rome and her daughters to do these things for vestments, temples, graveyards, bells, and "their infant offspring ;" but a Christian cares for none of these things ; he serves God in the newness of the spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. If rightly instructed, he will not even dedicate a meeting-house to the service of his Master. He will with joy meet his fellow disciples and their children, his friends and neighbors, in a new meeting-house, and rejoice with them in every addition to their comfort in worshiping their Creator ; but while regarding all things as belonging to God, he looks upon nothing as peculiarly sacred but human hearts filled with the love of Christ.

In the consecration of any one, under the law to the priest's office, atonement was made for him by the shedding of blood, and part of the blood shed was to be sprinkled on his person, as well as before the Lord. This consecration gave rise to the expression, "blood of sprinkling." We, then, believe in sprinkling, but it is the sprinkling of blood, and not of water. The sprinkling of mere water is not found in either law or gospel. In the 19th chapter of Numbers we

find a full account of the water of separation which was sprinkled on the unclean. This was a peculiar appointment as any one may see by reading carefully the whole chapter. This water of separation freed the person from ceremonial impurity, and is the ground of the beautiful prophecy : " Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." (Ezekiel xxxvi., 25.) This water of separation was composed of the water of a running stream, and the ashes of a red heifer, slain and burnt with all belonging to it. While burning, cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet wool were to be thrown into the fire, then all was gathered up and kept for further use. But the use of this did not relieve one from the necessity of bathing the whole person in water, as may be seen in the 19th verse of the chapter.

Whoever wishes to get a clear idea of the ceremonial use of blood, water, and oil, should read, in connection with this chapter the 14th of Leviticus, in which we have the ordinance for cleansing the leper; and he will see from these, and the other ceremonies of the Jewish ritual, that those consecrated and those to be cleansed came to the sprinkling of blood, the washing of water, and the pouring of oil, before they dare enter the sanctuary to enjoy communion with God.

To confound these distinctions is to miss half the beauty and significance of both law and gospel. We may carp at the arrangements of God, and find seeming exceptions to the rule of his procedure, just as a carping naturalist may do in respect to the work of God, but in such a spirit we can never learn much of either his word or his works. Since time began, the literal use of blood, water, and oil in religious service is, that we are besprinkled with blood, bathed in water, and anointed with oil. Derange this order, and you mar the beauty of divine ordinances. Blood is not poured, neither are we immersed in it; water is neither sprinkled nor poured upon us; we are not immersed in nor besprinkled with oil.

It is hardly necessary to say that the blood of Christ is to us what the blood of sacrifice was to the Jews. Baptism answers to the ablutions of the law, and we are anointed with the Holy Spirit, instead of the oil of consecration, used in the tabernacle service, and in setting apart prophets, priests, and kings. In the Christian institution our hearts are sprinkled, our bodies washed, and our heads anointed; the first atones, the second purifies, and the last sanctifies, and thus prepared we come into the true sanctuary, and eat bread and drink wine in communion with God and one another, as priests of the Most High.

Does the phraseology of the New Testament conform to this view of the subject? Is this analogical argument confirmed by the style of the apostles, in their allusions to the former dispensation? Let us see. We open first to Heb. ix., 13, and read : " For if the blood of

bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God." Again, 19th verse : "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying : This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry, and almost all things are by the law purged by blood ; and without shedding of blood is no remission." In the 10th chapter and 22d verse we find these words : "Let us draw near in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." This is just such an allusion as we would expect from one who believed that the heart of the Christian had been sprinkled with the blood of Jesus, and his whole body immersed in baptism. In the following chapter, 28th verse, the writer speaks of "the passover, and the sprinkling of blood ;" and in the 12th chapter, 24th verse, the expression is used, "blood of sprinkling." Peter says in his first epistle, i., 2, we are "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

If we are said to be washed in his blood, to drink his blood, to be guilty of his blood, etc., these are metonymics, and in nowise conflict with the idea that blood is always literally sprinkled. It is only when mingled with this, or the ashes of the blood-colored heifer, that water was sprinkled at all. It were easily proved that to sprinkle mere water on man, woman, or child, on either head, body, or feet, in Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian ages, for any purpose, religious or secular, was never enjoined by divine authority. It is, therefore, of the fathers, and not of God, and ought to be rejected as a human tradition.

The New Testament allusions to the connection between blood and the guilt of sin are not more striking than between water and its impurity. As a specimen, take the following : "Wash away thy sins." (Acts xxii., 16.) "But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. vi., 11.) There is only one washing in the name of Christ known to the gospel. "That he might cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water by the word." (Eph. v., 26.) Paul says : "He (God) saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Titus iii., 5.)

A few passages in which Christians are said to be anointed with the Holy Spirit, as the antitype of oil, must suffice. "Now he which

hath anointed us is God." (2d Cor. i., 21.) "Ye have an unction (anointing) from the Holy One." (1st John ii., 20.) And of Christ is it said, "How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit." (Acts x., 38.) "He hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." (Heb. i., 9.)

The Lord's Supper is not a sacrifice, but a *feast on sacrifice*. We can not in this paper, already too long, elaborate this idea. We only observe that in ancient times, when sacrifices were made, the worshippers feasted thereon. The reader will be delighted with this idea, if he examine it in the light of sacred and profane history. This simple thought overthrows the doctrine of the Popish Mass—that Christ is really offered as a sacrifice in the Supper. No, it is not a sacrifice, but a feast on sacrifice; and in that feast bread and wine are used, through which we commune with God and our brethren, even as Abraham and Melchizedek, when the latter brought forth bread and wine, as I understand it, after sacrifice. The Savior took bread and wine left from the Passover Supper, which clearly was a feast upon sacrifice, and appointed these to be the emblems of his flesh and blood, through which we are to hold communion here on earth, till at the Lamb's marriage supper he will eat and drink anew with us in his Father's kingdom.

Quotations on all these points might be multiplied, but we depend on the readings of those interested in this argument, in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, with the commentary on them, contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But to what purpose all this waste of precious ointment of God's word? Yet, if by dwelling longer we could bring one member of Christ's body to a better understanding of his ordinances, we would break the box, however costly, and pour it even on his feet.

But if men will not, by the simple instructions of the Scriptures, learn the forms of God's ordinances, it is hardly to be expected that they will be convinced by these types. But to those who keep the ordinances as delivered to them by the apostles, how these types and symbols, these analogies and figures, these forms and patterns, illustrate and confirm their faith! And what a beautiful imagery and charm they throw around many things in the gospel, that to a sectarian must ever remain without meaning and without comfort!

A thought, and we are done for this number. It is, that patriarchs and prophets, angels, saints, and martyrs—all in heaven—draw their highest inspiration and are transported into inexpressible ecstasy in the contemplation of this mystery of mysteries. Man's redemption by the blood of the cross, his cleansing by the washing of regeneration, and his renewal by the Holy Spirit, thus being made a king and a priest in the presence of God, is the transcendent theme in the heaven of heavens, and for all the cycles of eternity. Well may we

all discrown ourselves in the presence of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," then join with the orchestra of the skies in the triumphant song, with harp and voice, soft at first as an infant's breathing, but increasing with the notes of innumerable hosts, till arch and pavement tremble in unison with the sound as of many waters.

"The holy to the holiest leads," let us enter and worship the Maker and Redeemer of all.

No. 6.

We intend to devote this number of our essays on Scripture Types to an examination of the tabernacle and its furniture, the position, use, and meaning of its main parts, the great lessons we are taught by the daily and yearly service performed for so long a time in it, and afterward in the temple. The latter was like the former in these particulars, and different from it chiefly in this, that it was permanent while the other was movable. It was also larger, to accommodate the increased number of worshipers when Israel became settled under the reign of Solomon. The lessons taught by both are the same. We shall select the tabernacle because it is the original, and because Paul chooses it in his admirable treatise on type and anti-type in his letter to the Hebrews.

That we are not wandering in the mazes of the allegorical and mystical, without a light or a guide, is apparent to the most careless reader of the 9th chapter of that epistle. If we had no other allusion to the typical nature of the tabernacle and its service in the New Testament, this 9th chapter would be enough to authorize us to look at this beautiful tent as an expressive type of the Christian system. Paul expressly affirms, in the 24th verse, that the holy places made with hands are the figures (types) of the true. The same in effect is repeated again and again in this chapter, and is confirmed by the tenor of the whole epistle. In fact, a leading object of the apostolic writings is to show that the Christian institution is the anti-type of the law, ordinances, and worship of the Jews.

But let us attend strictly to the tabernacle and its service, and note what lessons they have for us. A tabernacle is simply a tent, a movable abode; and as the Israelites were compelled to live in tents for forty years in the wilderness, their God condescended to make a tent or tabernacle his visible abode during that time, and until Solomon built him a house. It was, in fact, the abode of their King as well as the place of their worship; it was both a palace and a temple, adapted to the migratory condition of Israel in the desert. Moses went up to this palace of their King, and received instructions as God's prime minister; and it was the temple in which Aaron, as their high priest, presented the worship of his people. After the

tabernacle was erected in the wilderness, and the economy and worship of Israel arranged, the tabernacle sustains this two-fold relation. Moses had the management of the government and Aaron of the religion, and both had access to God in his sanctuary, and received answers of peace from him, who was at once the King and the God of Israel. Their whole economy united both these elements—the political and the religious—in a peculiar manner. The system was a theocracy, and Moses and Aaron were but God's vicegerents on earth for the time being. This tent was built at the command of God, and according to his directions. The direction to Moses was, that he see that it was built according to the pattern shown him in the mount; and so particular was God that he inspired two men, Bezaleel and Aholiab, that they might, as master-workmen, construct everything according to his will. The interest God manifests in this tabernacle, the care he takes of it, and the large space it occupies in the Pentateuch, all go to show us its importance, and make it an object of close study to those who desire to obtain a full view of the Jewish and Christian systems.

Every Israelite had an interest in the tabernacle; it was constructed out of what was freely offered by the whole congregation; all contributed, and did it freely and liberally; it was the common property of all. All had access to its privileges, and all were required to defend it. While on the march, the tribes formed a hollow parallelogram around it, with Judah in the van, and Ephraim in the rear, Dan on the north side, and Reuben on the south. These were the chief, and the other tribes were marshaled under these. It must have been a glorious sight to have seen the camp of Israel around the tabernacle, the tribes all arranged under their captains, and all taking form from the ark of testimony. Its shape and proportion gave these to the whole camp. That it was indeed beautiful we have the testimony of an enemy. Hear it: "And Balaam lifted up his eyes and he saw Israel abiding in his tents according to their tribes; and the Spirit of God came upon him and he said: How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, and thy tabernacles, O Israel; as the valleys are they spread forth, as the gardens by the river's side, as the trees of lignaloes which the Lord hath planted, and as cedar-trees beside the waters!" (Num. xxiv., *et seq.*)

When Israel was stationary, and the tabernacle was set up, it consisted of an inclosed space one hundred cubits by fifty. Counting the cubit at twenty-two inches, nearly its true value, we have in our measurement a space of one hundred and eighty feet by ninety, inclosed by curtains hung on pillars set in brass, and all firmly set. This formed what is called the outer court; it was uncovered at top, and had its entrance at the east, wide and open to all Israel who were not disqualified from entering by some impurity. This outer

court was the place of sacrifice—the place where the sinner appeared with his victim, to be slain for his sin. Here the priest met him and began his ministrations on his behalf. Its pillars, and sockets, and furniture were all of brass. Its curtains were coarse and strong, its entrance wide ; it was always pitched facing the east, so that the worshiper always faced the west, and moved with the sun as he drew near to God. This outer court, too, being uncovered, needed no light but that of the sun ; it was, as its name indicates, an outer court.

Advancing westward we come to the tabernacle proper, of the same form and proportions as the outer court. It was about fifty-five feet long, twenty-two wide, and eighteen high. This was wholly inclosed and rendered impervious to light from without. Its fixtures were of gold, the sides of precious wood bound together by longitudinal bars, the whole very firm, and the top protected by no less than four coverings. The first, seen by the worshiper above him as a kind of canopy, was of fine twined linen, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, with cherubim of cunning work. Over this was the covering of goat's-hair cloth, then of rams' skins, dyed red, and last of all, a covering of badgers' skins. These curtains, as they are called, covered the sanctuary, and hung down over the ends of it ; they formed at the entrance on the east a curtain proper, which had to be drawn aside by him who entered the holy place. This holy place received no light from without, and was entered only by the priests, duly prepared in the outer court.

The holiest of all—the *sanctum sanctorum*—was formed by a very thick curtain drawn across the sanctuary about two-thirds of the way back from the entrance, thus separating a small space esteemed most sacred, entered only by the high-priest, arrayed in his robes of glory and beauty, and only on the most solemn occasions, and after due preparation, as we shall shortly see. The furniture of this part was of pure gold, and its light was the shekinah or divine presence.

Now, manifestly God did not arrange these apartments, give such minute directions to Moses about them, and take such interest in the due and proper ordering of everything in them, to no purpose. These things are not uninteresting trifles ; they can seem so only to those who have been too indolent or too careless to attend to their real typical meaning. Let us approach them with reverence. We have seen heretofore, in our investigations, that there are revealed in the Scriptures three great states or conditions for humanity, fully developed in harmony with God's great scheme ; these are *nature*, *grace*, and *glory*, or, the world, the church, and heaven. All this, and more too, is taught us here in type. The outer court is the type of the world, the holy place of the church, and the most holy of heaven. Humanity stands in this outer court of the world, with its sin upon it, and dependent on the light of nature ; it enters from the east and follows the sun.

God made man in the east, set his face westward, and so he has traveled ever since. It may not be long till the circuit is completed. We here in California are now looking to the cradle of our race in Southwestern Asia. The worshiper passed out of the outer court and entered by the door, if he entered at all, into the holy place ; he left the outer court and its natural light behind him, and entering into the holy place he received new light and enjoyed richer blessings. Here worship in its proper sense began ; he became now a priest, and officiated in God's sanctuary. We pass out of the world into the church ; we leave the world behind us, and by our entrance into the church we are made priests in the best sense of that term—its Christian sense. We depend no longer on natural light ; we have the light of God in his sanctuary, and we enjoy privileges guaranteed only to those who enter in by the door.

From the holy place the high-priest drew aside the vail, and stood in the presence of God. It was this vail that was rent from top to bottom, as by the hand of God, at the crucifixion of Christ, and Paul commenting on this, says : "Jesus has consecrated for us a new and living way through the vail, that is to say, his flesh, by which, with the blood of our slain victim, we may enter into the holiest of all." (Compare Heb. vi., 19 ; ix, 3 ; and x., 20.) Our High-Priest has drawn aside the vail, symbol of death, that separates the church below from the church above, and has entered into God's presence to officiate for us. We shall follow by-and-by. But mark, we pass out of the outer court into the holy place, and from the holy place into the most holy ; so humanity must pass out of the world into the church, and out of the church into heaven ; there is no other way. This is God's order, the order of his word, the teaching of all these types. What is literally taught elsewhere the types illustrate and confirm.

Let us now go back and examine the furniture of each apartment of this typical tent and learn what it teaches. In the outer court the first thing we see is the brazen altar, standing on our right hand, a few steps in advance of the entrance. It is about eight and a half feet square, and five feet high. Connected with it are all the utensils for performing sacrifice. It was here, day by day for centuries, first in the tabernacle and afterward in the temple, that offerings were made continually. Blood flowed here in rivers, victims died by thousands, sinners innumerable came to this for forgiveness ; "without shedding of blood is no remission." Now for the antitype. Christ died in the outer court, he died a victim, and his blood was taken into heaven, the true holiest place, and there made reconciliation for iniquity. The Jewish worshiper came first to the altar in the outer court ; the sinner now in the world must come to Christ and his sacrifice. This is the ground of the whole matter. There is no approach to God but by the blood of Jesus. We must come to the brazen altar, where bleeds the Lamb of God.

The worshiper made a few steps and came to the brazen laver on his left ; the way into the holy place passed by this also. It is so now. As the blood of Jesus removes our guilt, so, by divine appointment, water is to remove our impurity. We wash as the priests of old, and are prepared to enter into the holy place. Baptism is at this laver, and it is in the outer court, or the world. It is not in the holy place, the church, nor is it at the door ; it is just before the door, and by it we come to the door. Our Baptist brethren have been tugging and sweating for many years to get the brazen laver into the holy place, forgetting that it is too large, and that by getting it in they would throw into disorder all the beautiful furniture Moses placed in the holy place. We can not put baptism inside the church without deranging every item of the gospel ; and this the Baptists do by first receiving the sinner on his Christian experience, as it is called, and afterward baptizing him, not to put him into Christ, the door, but because he is in Christ already, by faith alone.

In the holy place the first thing was the golden candlestick, very precious and costly, with its seven branches, its bowls, knobs, and flowers ; its light was constant—it never went out ; the sacred oil was well supplied, and by its light all the beauty and glory of the sanctuary was seen. The Spirit of God, symbolized by the oil of the tabernacle service, is in the lamp of God's word ; it is truly a light to our feet. This candlestick typifies the word of God, through which the Spirit of God enlightens all who by blood and water enter the church, the true holy place. Here also the priests saw on the opposite side—the right hand—the golden table, on which were the loaves of the presence, removed once a week, and eaten by the priests. In the church we have a table, even the table of our Lord's presence among his people, and at it once a week his priests and kings do eat and are filled. The Lord's Supper is beautifully symbolized by this table of show-bread. We advance, and before us is the golden altar and the burning incense, setting forth the throne of grace and the prayers of God's people. John, in the Revelation, saw this, and he was told it was the prayers of the saints. From the holy place, the church, prayer as incense is going up continually. Here, then, we have in the church light, sustenance, and heaven, by communion ; and as purified and anointed priests of God we perform acceptable service, while our High-Priest alone has as yet gone into the heavens—the holiest of all.

We draw aside the vail, that vail of death which Jesus rent, and through which we may not fear to follow him, and, behold, we are in the presence of God ; there is his throne—the propitiatory, overshadowed by the cherubim and resting on the ark of the covenant, with the law at its side, the manna, and the blooming rod of Aaron. Justice and mercy embrace each other before God. Angels' food, heav-

only manna, immortality, the urim and thummim, and all divine lights and perfections, are in this true *sanctum sanctorum* of the universe. Here God displays all his adorable attributes before saints and angels, for "in his presence is fullness of joy, and at his right hand are pleasures for evermore."

Here, then, we rest. If it gives the man of refined taste and sensibility pleasure to visit the cathedrals and galleries of the Old World, and look on the works of the great masters, Michael Angelo, Raphael, Domenichino, and De Vinci; if the immortal works of these gifted men speak to him of times and scenes and characters long since passed away, and bring back to life, as it were, the heroic deeds of saints and martyrs, confirming his faith, and inspiring him to a like heroism, let these beautiful pictures, that silently set forth in prophecy and type the glorious achievements of our Redeemer and the beauty of his religion, be fixed in our hearts forever, and incite us to a more intense devotion.

No. 7.

THE present number will conclude what we have to say on Scripture types. The subject is by no means exhausted. It has grown on our hands, so that in fact we now have more that we could say than all we have said on this instructive theme. We feel confident that if any of our readers will read only once through the five books of Moses and the whole New Testament, and do this with care and in the light of what we have said in these essays, he will unite with us in our admiration of the typical system revealed in the Scriptures, and in our devotion to its study.

We have aimed to be sober and discreet in handling this subject; we have avoided the imaginary and fantastic; though often tempted to stop by the roadside to cull a flower here and there, we have resolutely kept on our way, and avoiding conjecture, we have, we trust, kept within the precincts of Scripture. We have felt at ease only when we were at the side of Paul, whom we chose at the outset as our chief guide. And so desirous have we been not to weary our readers, that, though often invited by our apostle to pick up this and that similitude to add force and beauty to our theme, we have kept right on to the end. If the reader will give himself to a few months' study of typology, and then reading over these articles shall conclude that they are very tame, and that they come very far from doing justice to the subject, we shall take it, strange as it may seem, as a great compliment, for our aim has been not to write a treatise on types, but to excite in our readers an interest that would lead them to investigate for themselves.

Especially do we urge on our preachers this pleasant duty. How many hours are wasted in light and frivolous conversation, that, spent

in the study of the typical parts of Scripture, would enrich our sermons with gems of thought that would not fail to attract the common mind. To hear many of our ministers, one would suppose that prophecies, types, allegories, parables, and figures ought to be studiously avoided in our pulpit ministrations as things dangerous and forbidden, whereas we can read scarcely a page of the memoirs of Christ, or the epistles of the apostles, without meeting these on every hand ; and no argument is necessary to convince us that this method of teaching has a strong hold on the popular taste, in view of the simple fact that those hymns that contain the most of the allegorical and typical are, other things being equal, the most frequently sung, both at public meetings, and around the fireside. How many a despairing saint has been revived and cheered when fatigued and faint from the toils of the journey, by hearing the hymn—

“ On Jordan’s stormy banks I stand,
And cast a wishful eye
To Canaan’s fair and happy land,
Where my possessions lie.”

Facts, and arguments, and logic are good, indispensable, in preaching the gospel to this captious age ; but let us not neglect the example of Christ and the apostles, who throw around all they say an indescribable charm by using the typical, allegorical, and figurative, on all occasions. Only let us be scriptural in all this ; let our discourses prove to our hearers that, while we constantly recommend to them the word of God and deplore its general neglect, we ourselves are in love with it, and can say about it more than a few generalities that have been repeated a thousand times by others ; that we know more about God’s holy word than a few platitudes concerning the first principles of the gospel, which are repeated *ad nauseam* on all occasions.

He who once taught the dwellers, in Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee the deepest truths concerning God, and the duties they owed to him and to one another, from the lilies of the field and the birds of the air ; who seems always to have chosen his parables and illustrations from what was common and well known, often from what was transpiring at the time, in sight of his hearers, were he now on the earth, would he not, in view of his perfect knowledge of all the things of nature, and the ability of men now to understand his allusions, draw on all departments of nature and her laws to explain the deep truths of redemption, of salvation, of duty, and of progress in virtue ? And would not this divine teacher keep before our minds the deep things of Moses and the prophets ? Would he not call up the typical import of the brazen serpent thus : “As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up ; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.”

In view of his method while he was here on earth, and in view of

the course followed by all the apostles, and particularly by Paul, we are fully authorized, nay, we should feel it to be our duty to teach the ignorant and those out of the way the things of the kingdom of heaven, by allusions to the beauties of God's works and the types of his word. We should thus show our cotemporaries that nature and the supernatural are but halves of the whole and complete system of God. We can know that system only by studying both of these, and the relations they sustain to each other. We can learn much of man and religion by meditating upon "The filial and loyal bee ; the house-building, wedded, and divorceless swallow ; the intelligent ant tribes, with their commonwealths and confederacies, their warriors and captains, their pickets and vedettes, their sappers and miners." The fact is, there is nothing in nature, from the grain of mustard seed to the cedars of Lebanon, from the gems of purest ray serene the dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear, up to the joyous stars and the glorious sun, that does not serve in some relation to set forth the glory of our Redeemer and the worth of his religion.

So in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we may follow where our great Teacher and those who followed him lead the way. With them as interpreters, we may ponder the wonders and the mysteries of by-gone dispensations, and feel our faith and our hope of rest confirmed ; our love for God and our charity toward our fellow-men increased ; and our conceptions of Christ and his divine work greatly enlarged by making allegories and types, the prophecies and symbols, the dreams and visions of holy men and seers, the subjects of reflection. No duty is paramount to our becoming familiar with the life and character of our Savior, his mission and work ; but our conceptions of him and his achievements on our behalf will be imperfect, till we are made acquainted with his great personal types, whose lives are recorded in the Jewish Scriptures mainly to set forth some point connected with the Messiah. Thus we have Adam, Abel, Noah, Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, Gideon, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Jonah, and a multitude of less fame, to typify our Lord Jesus in some point of his character, office, and work. Take from Old Testament saints and heroes this typical character, and you rob them of half of the interest that clusters around their names. Nor can we see why they should be mentioned at all in a divine revelation but that they serve the purpose we have been endeavoring to explain.

(Concluded in our next.)

"WHEN a man takes more pleasure in earning money than in spending it," says a popular writer on economy, "he has taken the first step toward wealth." This is good in its place ; but it may be well to be reminded, that when a man takes more pleasure in hoarding money than in doing good with it, he has taken a long step toward perdition.

DELAY OF THE PRESENT NUMBER—EXPLANATION.

TO MY SUBSCRIBERS.

Dear Brethren :—The present number of the *Quarterly* is greatly behind time. No one can regret this more than I ; yet herein am I not to blame. You, no doubt, expect an explanation of the fact, and in this I deem you right. An apology I am sure you do not want ; for this would imply something wrong on my part, where nothing of the kind exists.

In December last I took cold, which settled on my lungs. In a short time I found myself fast confined to bed. For three months from that date I was not able to preach one discourse nor write one line for the *Quarterly*. Hence the present delay. With this I hope you will all consent to be satisfied.

Further : you will find the present number mostly filled by contributions from other hands than my own. I hope you will not deem it the less, but rather the more, valuable on that account. One main object in starting the *Quarterly* was to afford many of our more promising brethren an opportunity of cultivating themselves as writers. Many of them, I well knew, possessed the power of long, well-sustained thought ; while others were endowed with highly respectable critical ability. The cause we plead needs the aid of both these. To afford them full scope for development and education has been a constant object of the present work. I am gratified to know that much good has been done in this way. In time to come, I hope to be able to write much more for the work ; though I am far from thinking it will from that cause be the better. Many of my present contributors I now value so highly, that I would rather far read their pieces than my own. Hence I delight to give them space on these pages.

And now, dear brethren, I have a suggestion to make, which, I trust, will receive your warm and active sympathy. During my long sickness I could neither travel nor preach. Thereby I failed to get many subscribers, to whom otherwise I should to-day have been sending the *Quarterly*. Could I not, in view of all the facts, induce you to determine at once to aid me to run my subscription list up to at least two thousand names. It lacks one thousand of that number now. *To our preachers especially is this appeal made.* To no class of men among us is the *Quarterly* of so much service as to you. Has it not, then, some claims on your countenance and support ? With even half an effort, if you will only make it unitedly, you can place the *Quarterly*, in six months, high above danger. Then I propose to make it still far more and far better than what it now is. Shall this appeal be enough ?

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

JULY, 1867.

No. 8.

FAITH—ITS DEFINITION.

IN the preceding number of the *Quarterly* appeared an article, of far more than average ability, on the subject of faith. From much which that article contains the present paper will not be a dissent. Still it is thought that a few points there maintained may be profitably reconsidered, and in this way the whole article be somewhat supplemented. To this important task the following pages will be devoted.

In the article just referred to, an air of originality in discussing the subject will be obvious to any one who carefully reads the article. This arises from two sources—the material introduced into the article, and the manner of handling it. Heretofore, in discussing faith, we have generally contented ourselves with popular views respecting it, without attempting to search it to the bottom. What is faith? is a question which we have always asked with interest, but seldom with sufficient severity. Our answer for the most part has been hereditary and a tradition, and not drawn as strictly from the sacred fountain as it should have been. L. in his article has completely ignored the popular conventional methods of treating faith. His object has been to break wholly away from the ancient prescriptions in the case, and rest the investigation exclusively on a scriptural basis. This it is that imparts to his article the air of which I speak. The circumstance is justly commendable, and worthy of general imitation. Many important topics of Christianity call loudly in the present day for a similar investigation. The real truth respecting them is, that we have derived our views of them from unauthoritative sources, and merely *think* we have them from the Bible, when such is not the fact. They urgently need to be rewritten, and our conceptions of them to be conformed more closely to the divine originals. Were this done, many a fine feature of Christianity, which now wears a dull inanimate appearance, would glow with vitality and be replete with power.

The passage which supplies the matter for L.'s article, and from which the contents of the present piece will be chiefly drawn, is the following: "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." (Heb. xi., 1.)

L. objects to calling this a definition, and insists that it is a description. I am not sure that in this he is helping us much. Against it as a definition he says : " With a view to showing what faith is, how it comes, and what are its fruits, both internal and external, this passage is analyzed, its different terms explained, which, when put together, form, we are told, the apostle's definition of faith. Ministers of the gospel who use the word definition in such a loose, empirical sense, should have, we think, a more correct conception of the true idea and office of a definition. Definition, from the Latin *definitio*, meaning literally the tracing of limits, the running off and laying down [of] a boundary, aims to determine a thing in its compass and extent, to point out the constituent parts of the essence of that which is to be defined ; so that, strictly speaking, nothing is susceptible of definition which does not admit of the process of analysis and synthesis, either physically or metaphysically, really or ideally."

This paragraph, which is a main one in L.'s article, is to my mind marred by some confusion, and yet in places it clearly exhibits the lines of truth. To define is to trace around a thing, material or the reverse, a line, actual or ideal, which separates it from all other things, and thus makes it stand apart by itself alone. This is the literal or etymological meaning of the word ; and this is definition. But the object of definition is often slightly different from this, and is so always where it is twofold. 1. Its object may be simply to separate one thing from another, and thus show distinction. 2. It may be to determine the nature of a thing. That, properly, is definition ; this, investigation. Now to my mind few things are clearer than this, that in the passage just quoted, and by it, faith is separated or distinguished from all other things, and its real nature determined. But this is the highest and best type of definition. I hence feel that the passage contains a definition. But L. says : " Definition aims to point out the constituent parts of the essence of that which is to be defined." The word " essence " confuses this sentence. The whole is rendered clear thus : Definition aims to point out the constituent elements of the thing to be defined. But L. says further : " Nothing is susceptible of definition which does not admit of the process of analysis and synthesis. This position I think utterly untenable. I can certainly define the word atom ; and yet it is essential to the very notion it expresses that it shall not be susceptible of analysis. So with the word point. The mathematician defines it with great clearness. Yet it admits of neither analysis nor synthesis. Illustrations might be multiplied indefinitely, but these are enough. Now certainly it may be true of faith that it is insusceptible of analysis ; but does it therefore follow that it can not be defined ? I think not. Certainly it may be set apart by itself, or separated from everything else ; so that the mind shall take cognizance of it as a simple or single thing. But this

is definition. Hence, even allowing that faith can not be analyzed, and it does not thence follow that it can not be defined. If it be a unit or simple thing, surely it can be exhibited as such ; or if a compound, then can it be analyzed, and its elements pointed out. Therefore, from every view we can take of it, it still seems to be susceptible of definition.

But this is comparatively an unimportant point. The real question is, not is faith definable, but what is faith? If we can only succeed in obtaining an answer to this question, we shall not be contentious as to the name we shall give the means through which we get it—as to whether we shall call it a definition, or a description. We are concerned with the thing, not with the channel which yields its true idea.

Of one thing we can speak with confidence—a definition of faith, if one be possible, is certainly a necessity. This is obvious from the confusion in which the subject is involved at this day. The endless disputes had over it, the countless efforts made to determine its nature and elucidate it, together with its high inherent and admitted value, certainly call for something which shall be final, and quiet the public mind respecting it. Nothing could so successfully effect this as a clear definition. It is strange if one is impracticable.

The value of every definition consists in this, that when enounced it shall raise in the mind of the hearer a view of the thing defined corresponding precisely to the view of him who constructs the definition ; so that the two views, on being compared, shall answer to each other, just as face answers to face in a perfect mirror. Is this true of the definition in hand? Certainly it is not true of our translation of it. When I repeat the language, "faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," I hardly think the reader feels that the subject is clear to his mind. But where lies the difficulty, and does it admit of remedy? We must be patient in answering these questions.

But one course seems to me to be left us, and that is to take up and examine one by one the terms in which the apostle couches his conception of faith. If this course does not yield us the object we are in search of, we are not likely soon to attain it. With a feeling somewhat assured, but far from being too confident, we shall try it.

The first word demanding our attention is the Greek word *hupostasis*, rendered in the passage in hand substance : "Now faith is the substance (*hupostasis*) of things hoped for." This is a compound word, from *hupo* (ὑπό) under, and *histemi* (ἵστημι) I stand ; and literally or primarily means standing under, an underprop, a support, a basis, ground, or foundation. This, I repeat, is the first or etymological meaning of the word. But the etymological meaning of a word is not necessarily, in a given case, its true meaning. This is certain-

ly true. Yet, unless some circumstance exists requiring a different meaning, the etymological meaning is to be held, in every instance, as the true one. This is the rule in the case ; and to set it aside is arbitrary and inadmissible. Is this, now, the meaning of the word in the passage in hand ? I believe it is ; and yet I am ready to say my mind is not wholly free from doubt. But, before we can reach our final conclusion, we must carefully examine the history or usage of the word in the New Testament. Only when our induction is complete can our final inference be held as exhaustive.

The word occurs in the Greek New Testament five times. These occurrences are very handsomely examined by L. Indeed, he treats them with a skill not often met with in one of his years. I am delighted with the hope which his keen pen inspires.

The first occurrence is in 2 Cor. ix., 4. In our common version it reads thus : "Lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not you) should be ashamed in this confident (*hupostasei*) boasting." By Bro. Anderson it is rendered thus : "Lest, possibly, should the Macedonians come with me, and find you unprepared, we (not to say you) might be made ashamed by this same confident (*hupostasei*) boasting." By the Bible Union thus : "Lest haply, if Macedonians come with me, and find you not ready, we (that we say not ye) should be put to shame in respect to this confidence (*hupostasei*)." By Green thus : "Lest, should Macedonians come with me and find you unready, we—not to say you—should be put to shame in this hardihood (*hupostasei*)."¹ Here now are four versions. In two of them the word is rendered confident ; in one, confidence ; in the last, hardihood. This is enough to indicate that the word is not free from difficulty ; and at the same time to show that no uniform rule has been followed in rendering it. These translations can not all be right ; they may all be wrong ; and if so, what is the sense of the word ? Its original or etymological meaning we now have before us. Does a necessity exist for departing from this meaning ? I am candid, yet modest, to say I do not see it. To depart from this meaning seems to me to be arbitrary and without rule. Indeed, may not this be the very circumstance which accounts for the many discrepant renderings we have of the word ? Arbitrary renderings, of course, are without law. Hence, naturally, they are discordant.

I believe the passage is correctly translated by retaining the literal meaning of the word. Paul had given orders that aid should be collected for the poor saints in Jerusalem. In this work the Achaïans showed great promptness. This promptness caused Paul to boast of them to the Macedonians, in order to incite the latter to like deeds. It was the very ground, the *hupostasei*, of his boasting. But should Macedonians come with him and find the Achaïans not ready, this

the ground of his boasting would, of course, become his shame. This he desired to avoid, and hence sent brethren beforehand to have them in readiness. The whole passage may, at the instant, be tolerably rendered thus : For as to the aid which is for the holy it is needless for me to write you. For I know your promptness which I boast of in your behalf to Macedonians, that Achaia has been ready since last year ; and your zeal has aroused many. But I sent the brethren that our boasting which is in your behalf might not be vain in this item, that, as I said, you might be ready ; lest, should Macedonians come with me, and find you not ready, we, let me not say you, should be put to shame on this ground. Therefore it was necessary, etc. Hence it appears that the true meaning of the word is ground—ground of boasting, and not confidence. This, I believe, may be accepted as falling near the truth.

The second occurrence of the word is in 2 Cor. xi., 17. It stands thus in the common version : "I say again, Let no man think me a fool ; if otherwise, yet as a fool receive me, that I may boast myself a little. That which I speak, I speak not after the Lord, but as it were foolishly in this confidence (*hupostasei*) of boasting."

The Bible Union read it thus : "I say again, Let no one think me a fool ; but if it can not be so, yet receive me even if as a fool, that I too may boast myself a little. What I speak, I speak not after the Lord, but as in foolishness, in this confidence (*hupostasei*) of boasting."

Bro. Anderson reads the phrase : "in this same confidence of boasting." Mr. Green : "in this hardihood of boasting." Thus, in three of these cases *hupostasei* is rendered by *confidence*, in the remaining one by *hardihood*..

It would be idle to say that these authors had not reasons which, in their judgment, necessitated the renderings they have given. Still, whether these reasons were really sufficient or not can hardly be held as a closed question. To my mind, I am free to say they are not. On the contrary, since I see no necessity for departing from the literal meaning of the word, I hesitate not to render it literally. I would read it thus :

Again I say, Let no one deem me to be foolish ; but if not, still as foolish receive me, that I too may boast a little. What I say, I say not according to the Lord, but as in foolishness, on this ground (*hupostasei*) of boasting.

The third occurrence of the word is in Heb. i., 3, where its sense is difficult indeed. But this difficulty arises not out of the word itself, but from the subject-matter to which it is applied. It is used to denote the nature or being of God. It should therefore be no matter of wonder that the sense of the word is uncertain. I would translate it, as in the common version, by its exact Latin equivalent, substance,

thus : God, having anciently spoken in many places and many ways to the fathers by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom he has appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds, who being the effulgence of his glory and the representation of his substance (*hupostaseos*), and sustaining all things by his mighty word, etc. Possibly the word substance may here not express the exact sense, but it would be hard to find a word of which the same could not be said. It is better in such cases to translate *ad verbum* than *ad sensum*, unless we felt sure as to the sense.

The fourth occurrence of the word is in Heb. iii., 14. Here the sense is clear ; and it is hardly doubtful that the word ground or foundation exactly expresses it. Still I shall give the manner in which others render it, that the reader may have ample premises before him on which to rest his final conclusion.

The Bible Union give it thus : "For we have become partakers of Christ, if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence (*hupostaseos*) firm to the end."

T. S. Green thus : "For partners of Christ have we become, if only we hold the beginning of our assurance (*hupostaseos*) steadfast to the last."

Bro. Anderson thus : "For we are partakers of the Christ, if we hold our begun confidence (*hupostaseos*) firm to the end."

To all these I shall add the following, as expressive of my own conviction, only making it a little free for the sake of perspicuity : For we have become partakers of Christ, provided we hold our first ground (*hupostaseos*) firm to the end.

From these premises I believe we may afford to draw the conclusion, as very probably correct, that *hupostasis* is used in the New Testament in its simple primary sense, as denoting a ground or foundation. I shall hence, till better advised, take it in this sense. The weight of authority, I grant, is against me ; but the weight of reason and the sanction of etymology I feel to be with me. By these, for the present, I think it safest to stand. It is but just to add, that L. reaches almost the very same conclusion, from the same premises, in the article to which this will merely be an *addendum*.

I come now to consider the last occurrence of the word, and practically, perhaps, its most important occurrence. The passage containing it is variously rendered by different authors, as will appear by the following examples. True, the differences are not great, consisting, as they do, rather in the mode of expression, than in the matter. Still they are differences, and the cautious student will want the benefit of studying them.

Long ago Bro. Campbell rendered the passage thus : "Now faith is the confidence of things hoped for, and the conviction of things not seen." It is curious that one with so nice an appreciation of power

in composition as our lamented brother had, and who was so averse to enfeebling redundancies, should yet have admitted the word and between the preceding clauses.

The Bible Union : " Now faith is the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen."

T. S. Green : " Now faith is a grounded assurance of things hoped for, a clear warrant of matters not seen." It is deeply to be regretted that this fine author should be unwilling to express anything without using a style often obscure and always injuriously affected. He seems incapable of saying even plain things as other people would say them, and as they should be said.

Bro. Anderson : " Now, faith is a sure confidence with respect to things hoped for, a firm persuasion with respect to things not seen." This rendering is certainly perspicuous, but it greatly suffers from too many words.

Among these renderings, were I compelled to select one, I should certainly take that of the Bible Union. With slight exceptions, I think it faultless. Other specimens of translations might be presented indefinitely, but with little other effect than to increase variety. I shall hence content myself with a few, and these such as I suppose my brethren most familiar with.

Now, in lieu of all the preceding, but as varying only slightly from some of them, I submit the following, as a severely literal rendering of the passage, and, as I feel, strictly just to its sense : *Now faith is the ground of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.*

Faith, then, is the *ground* (*hupostasis*) of things hoped for, and not confidence nor assurance respecting them. Basis would here be a fine word for *hupostasis*, and not so hard as ground, thus : *Now faith is the basis of thing hoped for.* To this I should strongly incline, on account of its greater softness and equal elegance. It would be hard, in my judgment, to improve it. But the definition admits, as I deem, of just one more improvement. The word faith should give place to the word belief. We should then have, *Now belief is the basis of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen.* It will be long, in my candid opinion, before a change can be rung on this for the better. This the reader may call bold ; I know it to be modest.

But I must now turn back and subject some of the foregoing renderings to the test of criticism. After this I shall analyze the apostle's definition, and then assign reasons for preferring the word belief to the word faith. My work, though not then done, will be far advanced.

The reader will observe that *hupostasis* is represented in the preceding translations respectively by the words "confidence" and "assurance," and by the phrases "grounded assurance" and "sure confidence." Dropping the epithets "grounded" and "sure," as adding neither strength nor clearness to the sense, and the renderings vary

one from another only as confidence differs from assurance. Substantially they agree; for the difference between confidence and assurance is rather in sound than meaning. Is faith, then, correctly defined confidence? Before we can answer this question we must carefully note the fact that faith is not here defined generally, but exclusively with reference to things hoped for. The question is not what is faith generally, or what is faith with reference to the past; but what is faith with reference to the future, what is it with reference to things hoped for, or things which are the objects of hope? The answer is, it is confidence. Is this right? I do not believe it; and for so saying, assign the following reasons:

1. Confidence can never be shown to be the meaning of *hupostasis* in the New Testament. That it can be so rendered, and the sense made good, I readily grant; but good sense in a translation is not necessarily the true sense. Confidence, if a meaning of *hupostasis* at all, is so remote a meaning that nothing but the most obvious necessity can justify its use. I hence reject it.

2. Faith is from *fido*; confidence from *confido*, which is merely *fido* intensified by *con*. Hence to define faith by confidence is not to define one thing by another equivalent thing better understood, but to define a word by itself a little strengthened. It is as if we said, Faith is faith indeed as to things hoped for. And if the preceding renderings mean anything more or less than this, or anything different from it, I am not able to perceive it. They simply define faith by the use of an identical proposition, which is no definition at all.

But before we can fully appreciate the apostle's definition, and hence, perhaps, before we can precisely translate it, we must analyze it, and learn the several elements which enter into it, together with all the circumstances to which these elements stand related. For a little while this must now be our task.

I feel that whatever difficulty there is in determining the sense of *hupostasis*, is a difficulty growing out of the word (*ἐπιζόμενον*) *elpizomenon*, with which it stands immediately connected. This word, though not a compound word, is expressive of a compound thought; or rather, though one word, it carries in itself two thoughts, which, being wholly different, remain distinct. The word is a participle, plural, genitive, passive, and present, and hence means precisely, *things which are being hoped for*. It carries, therefore, the two ideas of *hope*, and the *things* which the hope respects. To these two objects faith stands related, and with relation to them is a *hupostasis*. It is not a *hupostasis* generally or universally, but only a *hupostasis elpizomenon*, a *hupostasis* of things hoped for. And since it is a *hupostasis*, not absolutely, but only with reference to hope and the things which the hope respects, it therefore follows that it must be the *hupostasis* either of the hope by itself, or of the things by themselves, or of the two jointly and together. There remain no other alternatives.

1. Is it the *hupostasis* of the two things—the hope and the things hoped for, jointly and together? This is L.'s opinion; and it is entitled to high consideration. It may be true. He argues that things hoped for have no existence as things hoped for except to faith; and that hence where there is no faith there are no things hoped for. In this case they are simply *non sunt*, exist not. The things themselves may exist without faith, but as things hoped for they can not. This is, beyond all question, correct; but whether this is what Paul meant to say is the point of doubt with me. The view looks more like it belonged to metaphysics than to the Bible. Still it is not therefore false, nor on that ground to be rejected. Between a true metaphysics and the Bible there can exist no antagonism, only we are not to transplant from that into this.

But this view would clearly require us to render *hupostasis* by the word ground, basis, or foundation—its literal etymological meaning. Things hoped for have no existence except to faith. It is hence the very basis of their existence—not the basis of their existence simply as things, but only as things hoped for. We should hence be compelled to render the first part of the definition, as previously said, thus: *Now faith is the basis of things hoped for*. Hardly could we err were we to pause on this as final.

2. Can faith be the basis of the things? Simply as things it can not. Only as things hoped for can it be their basis. As mere things, certainly the objects of hope may exist without faith. I conceive of an object of hope. I next conceive of the faith which stands related to it as an object of hope. Now I conceive of the extinction of this faith; but this does not necessitate the extinction of the object. Hence faith is not the basis of the things.

3. Is it, then, the *hupostasis* simply of the hope? Certainly faith is the basis of hope, in all cases its basis; hence where there is no faith there can be no hope. But whether it is the basis of the hope only is the question. But let it be first shown that faith is certainly the basis of hope. A few illustrations will render this clear.

A farmer prepares a plot of ground in his field, and on it sows a handful of wheat. Does he hope to reap the reward of his labor? That he does is intuitively clear. Here, then, is hope. Hence there must be faith; otherwise faith is not the universal basis of hope. But faith can not exist without an object; in other words, we can not believe without something to believe. What, then, in the present case is the thing believed? What the proposition—for all faith has respect to propositions? *The wheat will grow*. This is the proposition. This proposition the farmer believes, and hence his hope. On the contrary, if he does not believe the proposition he can have no hope. This the following will render clear:

He prepares another plot of ground in his field, and on it sows

another handful of wheat. In this case he has no hope ; but how is this ? He has no faith ; but why ? Every grain of this wheat is rotten. Hence he can have no faith that it will grow, and being without faith, he is consequently without hope.

Again : A. executes to me his note for the sum of five dollars, payable ninety days after date. This note contains a promise. This promise I believe ; and believing it, hope to receive the thing promised at the end of the time named. But C. also executes to me his note for the same sum, payable at the same time. This note likewise contains a promise, but this promise I do not believe. The reason is that C. is insolvent and wholly unable to pay his debts ; besides, he is notoriously false and would not pay if he could. I hence have no faith in his promise, and having no faith in his promise, I have no hope that I shall receive the sum promised. My want of faith determines my want of hope. And this is true universally in all the conditions and walks of life. Faith is the basis of hope. There is this distinction to be drawn in the case of a promise. The promise itself is one thing ; the thing promised a different thing. My faith respects that, my hope this. I believe *the promise*, but hope for *the thing* promised.

Let me now briefly apply this in the matter of religion. I hope to rise from the dead to the happiness of a spiritual body. But why ? Christ has left me a promise to this effect. I believe this promise, and hence hope for that body. But the atheist does not believe this promise ; hence he has no hope as to a spiritual body. My faith is the ground of my hope ; he is without the ground, and consequently without the hope.

Now in the expression "things hoped for" indisputably there is hope. Of necessity, then, there must be faith ; since without faith hope is impossible. Of this hope faith is and can not but be the basis. The faith is the hope's *hupostasis* ; and no more can the hope exist without the *hupostasis* than can vision without eyes, or an effect without a cause. Hence from the mention of hope we should have been compelled to infer a *hupostasis*, even had Paul said nothing about it. Now, in my candid opinion, this is precisely the reason why he defines faith a *hupostasis*. He had in his mind the complex conception of hope and the objects of it. He wished to state the relation of faith to these things. But to the objects of hope faith sustains no immediate relation. It is related immediately only to the hope. To the objects of hope it is related only mediately and through hope, and then only in so far as hope exists. Destroy the hope, and you destroy the relation which faith sustains to the objects of it. Hence it was necessary to define only the relation of faith to hope, and not the relation of faith to the objects of hope, since the existence of that relation necessitates the existence of this. But to hope faith is rela-

ted as a *hupostasis*. Hence the definition : Now faith is the *basis* of things hoped for. But this can be made still more plain by taking *ἐλπίζομένων*, resolving it into its two component elements, and arranging these in due relation to each other and to faith. First, then, as already said, we have in *elpizomenon* hope and its objects, or hope and the things hoped for. Of these it is only to the hope that faith stands as a *hupostasis*. Let now hope be separated from its objects and placed between them and faith. The whole sentence then becomes perfectly clear, thus : *Now faith is the basis of hope in things*. In this we distinctly preserve both the things of *elpizomenon* and the hope ; we also represent the true relation of faith to hope ; and these things and this relation exhaust the apostle's expression. Our work with it seems to be done.

There is this still to be added, that the above rendering expresses the contents of *elpizomenon* actively, whereas they are expressed passively in the original. There we have hope and its objects ; but *the objects are being hoped for*. This is passive. But in the rendering we first give to hope a simple positive existence, and then make it look actively to its objects. By this, however, nothing is lost. For if the objects of hope are passively being hoped for, of necessity there must be some one actively hoping for them. The difference is simply in the mode of expression, not in the things expressed.

Again : the penetrating reader will observe that the apostle's expression amounts not so much to a definition of faith as it does to a statement of the use of it. Faith is not in itself and absolutely a *hupostasis*. It is so only relatively to hope. What faith is in itself in every case we are told in the second part of the definition, not in the first. In the first part we are told the use of faith. It is to be the basis of hope. But the best of all definitions is that which both tells us what a thing is and then the use of it. Hence to this class belongs the apostle's.

Now when we reflect on the influence which our hope exerts over our conduct, and the relation it bears to our happiness, we must all feel how great the necessity is that it should rest on some deep, and, if possible, imperishable foundation. The proposition that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is the sublimest proposition known to the world : the proposition that he is the Savior of men the most important. Faith in that proposition is the sublimest faith ; faith in this, the most important that can dwell in human hearts. The hope of immortality and eternal life rises in measureless degrees over all the hopes that have ever caused a thrill in human breasts. Now how exquisite the conception which lays down that faith as the basis of this hope. I am enraptured with its grandeur and simple beauty.

But I promised to assign reasons for preferring the word belief to the word faith. This is the proper place to redeem the promise. But

first let me assure the reader that I have no prejudice against the word faith. As a mere word I prefer it to belief, and wish it could be retained ; but it can not without the violation of two most fundamental principles in translating.

In the original we have two words, both derived from the same root, and having precisely the same meaning, except the difference between a noun and its closely cognate verb. These words are *pistis* and *pisteuo*. *Pisteuo*, in all its forms, we render by the word *believe*, and can render it by no other. To this we are pinned down by necessity. If now *pisteuo* means I believe, and we are compelled to use the word believe to express its meaning, then indisputably does *pistis* mean belief, and the word belief should be used to express it. This gives us a translation which is uniform and faultless. To translate *pisteuo* by *believe*, and *pistis* by *faith*, leads the reader to suppose that there must be a difference in meaning between the original words, and hence, of course, between the English ; whereas, such is not the case. Believe and belief, therefore, are the true and proper words to represent the originals. We should then get rid of the word faith as a Bible word. To this no Christian ought to object ; for about that word has gathered a world of confusion and mysticism ; and to part from these is no matter of grief to him who delights in the perspicuity of holy writ. For these reasons, were I translating the Scriptures, I should never use the word faith.

But the second part of the definition now demands our consideration. Repeating the word faith, and it stands thus in the common version : " Faith is the evidence of things not seen." In the Bible Union's thus : " Faith is the conviction of things not seen." In Bro. Anderson's thus : " Faith is a firm persuasion with respect to things not seen." Bro. Campbell, as follows : " Faith is the conviction of things not seen." Green thus : " Faith is a clear warrant of matters not seen."

The word which is here so variously rendered is, in the original, *elenchos*, pronounced *elenkos*. Four different words, it will be perceived, are employed to represent it, namely, evidence, conviction, persuasion, and warrant. Of these four Bro. L. prefers evidence. This I think the most serious blemish in his article. To my mind conviction is clearly the proper word. In the original I do not see even the semblance of evidence. I hence think L.'s exposition utterly erroneous. As a piece of composition, it is clear and excellent ; but as a criticism, I deem it wholly unsound.

Evidence is from *ex* or *e* and *video*, which literally means, I see from, or, more fully, I see one thing from another, or one thing by another. Hence evidence is that by means of which I mentally see things, which could not be seen without it. A person, for example, is accused of a crime. On simply hearing the accusation I can not say

whether he is guilty or not ; in other words, I do not *see* his guilt. But the evidence is adduced. In kind it is such as the nature of the case requires, and ample in amount. I now see the guilt of the man. Before I could not see it, because I had not the evidence—the medium of my mental sight ; now I can, because I have that evidence. But in this, as well as in the case of the passage in hand, the evidence is external to me, and not internal. The mind sees, not by means of anything in itself, by means of any power, capacity, or faculty it possesses, but by means of what is wholly exterior to it. In the language of L., the evidence is not subjective, but objective.

In what sense, I ask, unless it be in some loose rhetorical sense, can my faith be said to be the evidence of the fact of Christ's resurrection ? To me certainly my faith is not the evidence of the fact, much less can it be to any one else. On one condition only can faith be viewed as the evidence of an unwitnessed or unseen fact. If the faith could not exist without the fact, then the faith would prove the fact, would be the evidence of it. But too often does faith exist without the fact or thing believed to enable us to argue thus. Faith is not the evidence of things not seen. Faith is an effect, not evidence, to which evidence bears the relation of cause. Evidence produces faith—this I deem the better view.

But I have already said that conviction is the true word ; and this, of course, would imply that conviction is the thing expressed by the language in hand. I hence agree with Bro. Campbell and the Bible Union, and dissent from all the others. Faith is the conviction of things not seen. This is the word ; this the thought. But this is resting the conclusion on assertion, not on evidence.

The verb *elenko*, from which comes *elenkos*, the word in question, I have never thought a word susceptible of the very easiest definition. To me there seems something hazy about it, which leaves it not severely clear and definite. It occurs in the New Testament seventeen times, *elenkos* twice. The former varies in its meaning generally between rebuke and convince. To these its other meanings are closely akin. If any one, of all the places in the New Testament where *elenko* occurs, has any bearing on the passage in hand, that place is John xvi., 8. Here *elenko* clearly means to convince. The following will give the sense of the verse : And when come, he will *convince* the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. No word but convince will answer here. It gives the idea with faultless clearness and precision. Now a safe rule in translating is this : find a passage in which the meaning of the word you have in question is certain, is one, and can be nothing else. Then take the word in this same sense in every reoccurrence of it, till you are compelled to depart from it. We can follow no safer rule than this. Now in John xvi., 8, *elenko* indisputably means to convince. The noun derived from it,

then, ought to mean conviction. At least it would be far safer to take the noun in this sense than in some different arbitrary sense ; especially where nothing forbids it, and where the resulting meaning is clear and good. Hence I have no hesitation in so rendering it. Besides, that this is its meaning in the only other place where it occurs admits of little doubt. I would then render the clause in hand thus : *Faith is the conviction of things not seen.*

Now this I hold to be the definition proper of faith. Absolutely it is *conviction*. This is the thing itself—faith, in nature and degree. Determine that, and you determine this ; for the two are identical, and hence the complement of each other. With reference to hope faith is a *hupostasis*, a basis or foundation ; absolutely and in itself it is *elenkos*, conviction. That has already been shown to be certainly true ; can not this also be ?

Conviction is from *con*, intensive, and *vinco*, I conquer. But how from these can we get conviction in the sense of a firm mental assurance that a thing said is true ? With reference to any given proposition I can occupy one of only three positions—I believe the proposition, I am indifferent to it, or hostile. The first position is excluded, as implying the fact which it is now designed to show. But I am indifferent. In this case the object is to *overcome* my indifference, and this is a victory. Or I am hostile. In this case the object is to overcome my hostility, which is also a victory. So that in every case of conviction there is in fact a victory. But conviction, as the definition of faith, means simply a firm mental persuasion that a thing said is true. Nor does it matter whether the thing said is a simple affirmation or a promise. In the former case, my faith is my conviction that the affirmation is true ; in the latter, that the promise will be kept, but in both cases equally and alike it is conviction. True, conviction implies the highest degree of mental assurance that a thing is true. When I say I am persuaded that a thing is true, I express myself mildly ; indeed it can hardly be said that I express a faith at all. When I say I believe, this is stronger. But when I say I am convinced, I express a degree of assurance which can not be intensified. This is faith—the conviction that a thing is true. It is not strong conviction nor feeble conviction, deep conviction nor shallow, but simply and precisely conviction. In all cases and under all circumstances this is faith. Leave it unqualified. Use none of the preceding epithets. They serve no purpose but to darken the subject and bewilder the seeker after truth. They are not of the sacred book, but from a very different source.

From what is now before us, it will be perceived that the apostle's definition looks both to the past and to the future—to the past so far as it is embraced in history, to the future so far as it is embraced in prophecy and promises ; and history and prophecy and promises em-

brace all knowable time by us, except the passing moment. The definition therefore covers all time, the past and the future. Like a sub-lime arch, it sweeps over it all. Hence, in the very nature of things, there can be but one faith. This embraces all the past and all the future ; what portion of time, then, could a second faith embrace ? The thought is absurd. And if there can be but one faith, what becomes of the popular doctrine of *various kinds of faith*, as historic faith, evangelic faith, etc. Plurality is the very basis of kinds. Where there is just one thing, of course, we can not have kinds. But there is "one faith," so decided by inspiration ; hence kinds is impossible. If there was but one horse in the world, we could not talk of the various kinds of horses ; if but one tree, not of the various kinds of trees. No more complete delusion ever took possession of the popular mind than the notion of different kinds of faith. Faith is conviction without regard to object. Whether the affirmation be divine or human, whether it belong to mathematics or history—faith is simply the conviction that it is true. Here then, for the present, we leave the subject to the silent thoughts of the reader.

TO OUR SCHOLARS.—Brethren, has the time not now come when we should unite in an effort to perfect for ourselves and others a translation of the New Testament ? This work will never be done for us ; we must do it for ourselves. Why not, then, do it as soon as practicable ? I believe we are now in possession of the necessary literary aids, and that the men are among us who can do the work. I hence see not the reason in postponing it. Could we not at an early day have a conference of "chief men," and take the question seriously into hand ? Could we not in said conference consider first the question, Do we need the proposed translation ? 2. How many men should be selected to undertake it ? 3. Who should they be ? 4. How can we best raise the funds to carry on the work ? Shall we not hear from Bro. Milligan, Bro. Anderson, Bro. Pendleton, Bro. Loose, Bro. Proctor, Bro. McGarvey, Bro. Pettigrew, and other wise and competent men in the premises ? I am profoundly anxious to see a translation of the New Testament, as nearly perfect as the age in which we live will allow, placed in the hands of every human being who will either buy it or accept it as a gift and read it. My motto is, Let the translation be made, and trust to its merits and to Christ to give it currency. I see not how in any other way it is ever to attain it.

ΕΛΘΕΤΩ Η ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ ΣΟΥ.

WHAT meaning is to be attached to this petition? What latitude is to be given it? Are Christians of this age under obligations to offer it? If so, then would not the petition itself seem to conflict with what we understand the New Testament to teach concerning the kingdom and reign of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the earth? These are some of the questions that I propose to discuss in the present paper. But before I proceed with my investigation let us understand something concerning the nature of prayer. I hold this to be essential in order to a correct view of all the premises involved in the subject now under consideration. If the courteous reader will turn to the first number of the current volume of the *Quarterly*, he will find an article of some ten or a dozen pages under the heading and running title of "Prayer." In that article the writer attempted to exhibit the "nature of prayer;" and "under this head to include not only the various acts of the soul in devotion, but also some of the things to be guarded against in prayer." Further along the writer holds the following language on the definition of prayer: "The learned inform us that the last analysis of the word prayer shows it to consist of two words which answer to our English words with and vow; and that, literally and primarily, it signifies a binding of ourselves to God. * * * So, then, prayer is something more than mere words, even though the words spring from the heart. Sacrifice must ever accompany prayer, for sacrifice is to prayer what fire was to the altar. * * * The nature of prayer, therefore, seems to be that of covenant and sacrifice. Covenant as it respects God; sacrifice as it respects ourselves." This is sufficient for my present purpose, and I will now address myself to a critical survey of the second petition of the Lord's prayer. It will be observed that I assume this to be the *second* petition of the Lord's prayer. This position I am abundantly able to defend, but this is not the place to do it. I only call attention to the fact, that my readers may know that I have not written carelessly. The words which I have placed at the top of this page are, in the common version of the Scriptures, translated thus: "Thy kingdom come."

There is hardly a doubt as to the correctness of the translation, and that it reflects the exact idea of the original Greek. It remains only for me to admonish the reader that this petition must be understood in the light of our relations to God, to Christ, to one another, and to the world, and then the path of investigation lies straight before us. If to establish the reign of righteousness in every heart in-

volves something more than a mere formal petition, then that something more is involved in this petition. This petition means all that is embraced, first, in the inauguration, and, second, in the gradual development of that kingdom whose territory shall extend from the rivers to the ends of the earth. That the purport of this petition is generally misunderstood, I hold to be simply certain. That confusion exists in the minds of many of our brethren concerning it, is unquestionable. That I have been many times pained and grieved at the treatment it has received at the hands of those who were ignorant of the glorious lesson it teaches, my own heart tells me. One man offers the petition as though the kingdom of Christ had to no extent come. Of course, then, he is in deep error. Another man offers it, if at all, as though the kingdom of Jesus Christ had come in the most exhaustive sense of the word, and now embraced the whole human family as willing subjects. And, of course, this man is equally wrong with the other. I have heard a good brother begin: "Our Father who art in heaven; hallowed be thy name." So far all is smooth and easy. Not a single difficulty presents itself. But just at this point he reaches the petition: "Thy kingdom come;" and having a vague notion that the kingdom has come, he begins to halt, and stagger, and blunder, and modify, and comment, and explain, in a manner which, were the subject not so solemn, would be most ludicrous. Seldom do you hear one of our brethren plump it right out—full, and fair, and round; but they treat it as gingerly as though they had discovered a nest of young vipers.

Now I blame these brethren, not for their intentions, for these are good, but because they have taken some things at second-hand, and have consequently failed to inform themselves as they ought to have done. It is impossible that one man should know everything; hence, while a brother may be an expert in translating, or *au fait* as a commentator upon the Acts, it does not necessarily follow that he is equally skillful in all departments of hermeneutics. In truth, when a man's mind has long been occupied with one branch of biblical criticism, when he has some specialty engrossing his attention, he is less likely to be informed concerning many matters held to be of minor importance than some humbler brother of far less learning and ability.

That we have no use for the Lord's prayer, as I have heard some say, is a monstrous fallacy. That we use all its petitions in precisely the same sense as did those to whom it was originally taught is also very far from the truth. The whole religious world, so far as I know, are agreed as to the meaning, application, and obligation of all the other petitions in this prayer; why, then, should they disagree as to the meaning, application, and obligation of the second? Simply because all religionists do not entertain the same views concerning

what is rather loosely denominated the kingdom of Christ. The question then really turns upon the kingdom of Christ, whether it ever was, is now, or will be in the future, established upon the earth, and to what extent. When, then, we speak of the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of Christ, or the kingdom of heaven, what do we mean? I shall assume that the learning and wisdom of the religious world have settled down upon about the following: The word kingdom, in the sacred writings, is a term of frequent occurrence, and one that is variously applied. Its application and meaning are nearly, if not invariably, determined by the context. There is usually some qualifying word that will almost infallibly determine the precise thing meant whenever and wherever the term is employed. Thus we have "the kingdom of Sihon, king of the Amorites; and the kingdom of Og, king of Bashan." Then we have "the kingdoms of this world," "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven," "the kingdom of his dear Son," etc. When the kingdom of God in heaven, or on high, is meant in contradistinction from his kingdom on earth, there is also usually some qualifier indicating the fact; as, for example, 1 Cor. xv., 50, where we have these words: "Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God." Again: 2 Peter i., 11, speaking of the final reward, the apostle says: "For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ." There is, then, in the Holy Scriptures a broad distinction made between the kingdom of God in this world and the kingdom of God in heaven. A person may be in the former and never be enrolled among the happy subjects of the latter. All subjects of the gospel of Christ pass through the former into the latter. Jesus Christ, then, has a kingdom on this earth. He says: "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." This implies that all who are born again, whatever this may mean, can see the kingdom of God. But he amplifies. He says: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This implies that all who are born of water and the Spirit, which is the same as being born again, are in the kingdom of God. Again: we are commanded to "seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you." By "these things" the Savior means food, raiment, shelter, and such other necessary blessings as are required in this world. So then we can be in the kingdom of God, we can be clothed with his righteousness, and still be in this world.

The kingdom of Jesus Christ was a subject of prophecy. The prophet Daniel says: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Paul, speaking to the Christians of his day, says: "We have received a kingdom that can not be moved," *i. e.*, destroyed. Here, then, is a

perfect fulfillment of Daniel's prophecy. But the same prophet also speaks of it as a kingdom to be given with glory and dominion over all people, nations, and languages, to one like unto the Son of man. And the prophet Micah, speaking of the same era, represents it as a time when Jehovah, having removed all the afflictions of his people, would reign over them in Mount Zion forever. Paul says that we (Christians) have come to Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. The prophet holds out the promise ; the apostle speaks of the fulfillment. According to the prophecy of Daniel, this kingdom was to be inaugurated during the existence of the Roman empire, it being the last of the four great monarchies that were to succeed each other. Now the kingdom of the God of heaven was to be set up in the days, during the existence, of these kings ; hence the Jewish theocracy was not the kingdom of Christ. It typified it, but it was not the kingdom. Daniel says that this kingdom was to be set up by the God of heaven ; consequently it is variously styled in the New Testament the "kingdom of God," the "kingdom of heaven," etc.

When John the Immerser entered upon his ministry, as the immediate harbinger of Jesus Christ, he proclaimed the kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven, as "at hand." When Jesus sent out the twelve, under the first commission, he commanded them, saying : "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans do not enter. But go rather (only?) to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as you go, preach, saying : The kingdom of heaven is at hand." After John was imprisoned, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying : "The time is fulfilled"—that is, the time spoken of by the prophets above named—"the time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand." After his resurrection from the dead he came to the apostles and proclaimed himself thus : "All authority is given to me in heaven and in earth." This he could not have truly said previous to his death and resurrection ; for death overcame him, and for three days and nights he was held in its iron grip in the heart of the earth. But now, having triumphed over death, having cast away its shield and broken its sceptre, having unbarred the gates of the grave and risen from the dead, he can say truly what he could not have said before, namely : "All authority is given to me in heaven and in earth." Here was a conquest infinitely greater than any ever achieved by the Cæsars. Here was the conquest of death itself ! Christ had fairly won his right to the title of king. Henceforth he is not only a king, but the King of kings.

But all these predictions, proclamations, and stupendous events were but preparatory or initiatory steps leading to the precise and formal inauguration of the reign of Christ on the earth. When he

first entered upon his ministry he instructed his ambassadors to preach "the kingdom is coming." In perfect consonance with this preaching, he also taught them to pray "thy kingdom come." But as in the proclamation of the near approach of the kingdom he forbids the use of his name, so in the prayer that went along with the commission there is no mention of the name of Jesus Christ. "Tell no man," he says, "that I am the Christ." He was not yet fully prepared to sit upon the throne of his father David, and therefore he prohibited any official use of his name. When he could truly say that "*all authority*" was given into his hands, and that even death itself could exercise no dominion over him, then, and not till then, would he sanction the free official use of his name to all the world. "When," he says, "you receive authority from heaven, you shall in *my name* preach repentance and remission of sins, beginning at Jerusalem." This was both formal and explicit. It pointed to the lifting of the embargo from their lips. "Hitherto," he continues, "you have asked nothing in my name ; now ask, and your joy shall be full." On the first pentecost after his resurrection the mouths of his apostles were unsealed. Here is one of the memorable sentences that fell from their glowing lips : David "seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in the unseen, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus has God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, *being by the right hand of God exalted*, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has shed forth this which you now see and hear. * * * Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God has made that same Jesus whom you have crucified *both Lord and Christ*." This is clear ; this is perspicuous ; nay, this is glorious ! Right here converge all the rays of all the dispensations, types, shadows, and predictions of the past, and in the full flood of their overwhelming light we read and see that which we most desire to know, namely, that God has set his Son upon his holy hill of Zion, and that, in answer to prayer, he will give him the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession !

Here then, after this long digression, we come back naturally to the point whence we started. Our position, we perceive, is vastly different from that occupied by the people previous to the formal establishing of the kingdom of Christ on the first pentecost after his resurrection. To them the kingdom had come in no sense ; to us it has come in power and great glory. On this pentecost the King was throned and sceptred and crowned, the ambassadors or prime ministers received their credentials, the field of their operations—the whole world—was assigned them, the character of the persons whom they were to evangelize was indicated, and all the machinery of this gigantic monarchy was fully set in motion. Here then, the petition,

"thy kingdom come," in the sense in which they had offered it, was fulfilled. But is this all? Is this the *ne plus ultra* of the most transcendent prayer that Christ or man can offer? While the answer made to the pre-pentecostan disciples was glorious, is there not a brighter glory still awaiting it? Will not a fuller answer yet be given? I humbly believe there will, and shall now proceed to indicate the why and the how.

When Jesus taught the pre-pentecostan disciples to pray "thy kingdom come," he meant all that they meant; but he meant much more. How much more the time had not yet come to say. God and time would answer how much more. But because we do not pray "thy kingdom come" in the limited sense in which the pre-pentecostan disciples prayed for it, let us not fall into the opposite error, and conclude that as we do not pray for it in this sense, therefore we are not to pray for it at all. I say opposite error; for some contend that Jesus Christ has no kingdom on this earth, and they therefore pray, in every sense, "thy kingdom come;" while others contend that, as the kingdom was established on the day of pentecost, there is now no necessity for using the petition at all.

This petition had to the pre-pentecostan disciples a significance which, of course, it can not have for us. They knew of nothing, they saw nothing, that answered to their idea of a kingdom. We do; and herein lies the difference. Among the very last questions which they propounded to the Savior was: "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" The answer to this question was adumbrated in the second Psalm, which has already been quoted in this article: "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power. But you shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you; and you shall be witnesses to me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Here, then, we see indicated, in the clearest possible manner, Christ's interpretation of David's prediction. This is the practical comment upon that. The *modus operandi* of the apostles and evangelists in carrying into execution the terms and spirit of the commission are too familiar to my readers to need rehearsal in this place.

This petition, then, like the first commission under which the apostles acted, was susceptible of unlimited expansion and development. This is its true idea and meaning. The limited meaning attached to it by those to whom it was first taught, made no practical difference. They were not at that time prepared to give it a wider application; just as they were unable, in their then mental and moral condition, to give even the last commission that liberal construction which Christ intended it should receive. Notwithstanding the phenomena of pentecost, and the triumphs of the gospel for seven years subsequently, it

required a vision from heaven to convince even an inspired apostle that God's scheme of mercy embraced the Gentiles in its provisions. The commission, in their view, embraced none but the Jews ; in our view it embraces the whole world. So this petition, in the estimation of pre-pentecostan disciples, looked, no doubt, exclusively to the simple founding of Messiah's kingdom ; but in our view it looks to its progress and development, until the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. In this sense, then, and in no other, does the intelligent post-pentecostan disciple employ it. And we are under as much obligation to pray for the growth and majesty of his kingdom now as they were to pray for its formal inauguration then.

This petition sustains an intimate relation both to the preceding and succeeding petitions of the Lord's prayer. The preceding petition requires all men, everywhere, to hallow the name of God ; that is, to treat as holy that which is holy. Hence an apostle commands us to sanctify the Lord God in our hearts. The succeeding petition is to the effect that the will of God may be done on the earth as it is done in heaven ; and to this end, we are taught to pray in this petition, "thy kingdom come." The following petition, then, is but an expansion of the idea embraced in this. Again : being translated out of the kingdom of Satan, which is a kingdom of darkness, into the kingdom of God's dear Son, which is a kingdom of light, we will entertain such conceptions and enjoy such views of God as will cause us involuntarily to pray, "hallowed be thy name ;" while at the same time we will strive with all our ransomed powers to do his will on earth even as it is done in heaven. Therefore, until these results become general,—until all men can truly address God as their Father, until all men sincerely hallow his name, and until all his intelligent and responsible creatures endeavor to do his will on earth even as it is done in heaven,—we will not only have occasion, but it will be our duty to pray, "thy kingdom come."

It is often true that the nature and magnitude of a cause can be determined only by the effects which it produces. The effect, as it relates to us personally and individually, of the coming of the kingdom of God in the sense in which we pray for it, is to make us all partakers of the divine nature. This is a wonderful thought of the apostle. Partakers of God's nature ! The child partakes of the nature of his father. As the children of God, we hallow and revere the name of our Father ; we pant to do his will ; we yield cheerful obedience to his behests. God is Spirit. This is essentially his nature. Then this is the nature of which we partake. We are made partakers of his spiritual nature, become members of his spiritual family, and subjects of his spiritual kingdom, when we do his will ; not otherwise. Therefore not a soul of man has a gift to pray "thy

kingdom come," or to use any other petition in the whole formula, who does not use every effort in his power in all things to do the will of God.

The kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom. To a clear recognition of this fact the world is hard to bring. The sword can not win it, money can not buy it, luxury can not tempt it. When the Savior was upon the earth great and fearful delusions prevailed with regard to the nature of his kingdom. It is perfectly clear, from a candid consideration of the historical evidence, that the Jews expected nothing more than a mere temporal kingdom. This groveling notion Jesus himself could not, apparently, correct; for when he spoke of any other than a temporal kingdom, they did not or would not understand him. After the resurrection, the disciples, assembling in groups, and bitterly lamenting their deep and bitter disappointment, said one to another: "We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel." And even up to the very moment of his ascension, as their question proves, the apostles were in a condition of hopeless ignorance touching the character of the kingdom which he had come to establish. Mary, on the first day of the week, went early to the sepulchre, not to worship the living Prince of salvation, but to embalm the dead body of Jesus of Nazareth.

While standing in the judgment-hall, Pilate inquired: "Art thou a king?" Jesus answered: "Thou sayest;" which was a strong way of saying: "Thou sayest *what I am*, or what is true. I AM A KING." Pilate, like Herod, would have feared Christ as a king in their meaning of the word; therefore Jesus added: "My kingdom is not of this world." This was equivalent to saying: "I come not to occupy an earthly throne; I come not to reign over the Jews as a distinct people; I come not to enter into temporal conflict with the Cæsars; I come not heralded by the thunder of the captains and the shouting. No pageantry of war shall mark my humble processions; no cries of widows and orphans shall disturb my retirement; no burning towns and cities shall illumine my path; no garments rolled in blood shall mar the splendor of my peaceful conquests. There is nothing in prophecy intimating anything of this kind. I come, bringing my kingdom with me." On one occasion the Pharisees demanded of him: "When shall the kingdom of God come?" Now mark his answer: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here! nor, Lo there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within (among?) you." The kingdom of God is not food and drink; it partakes not of the earthly and sensual; but it is righteousness, and joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit. The motives of the gospel are not worldly; they look beyond the present abode of sin and death. The Son of God must reign in the hearts of his people. When the foundations of his kingdom were laid, no life was lost but his

own. The only sword unsheathed was the sword of the Spirit. If men were slain, it was that they might live forever. No roaring artillery ushered in that morning. No waving banners announced the advent of the King. The men who were to perform the most important part in this day's work, were not the grave doctors of the sanhedrim, not the counselors of state, not the leaders of vast armies, nor yet the king and his deputies. No ; a dozen swarthy, anxious, expectant fishermen in yonder upper chamber are about to receive the seal to a commission with which they will shake the world ! No eye saw the sweeping of the Spirit past the temple, no ear heard the rustle of his wings ; but soon, clothed with the power which it was his glorious work to bring, appear the holy twelve, in the streets of Jerusalem, as they enter upon the conquest of all kingdoms ! The lambent flames are seen, the many tongues are heard, and the work has begun ! By no meretricious aid, by no strong arm of human power, by no science of the schools, by no wisdom of men, by none of these ; but by the strength which the God of hosts imparts, do they hope to plant the standard of the cross until it shall proudly wave from every turret and tower of the habitable globe !

This, then, being the nature of the kingdom of God, we can easily see the propriety of praying for its coming to all our lost and ruined race ; of praying for the bending of every knee and the bowing of every spirit before the Lord. For Jesus must reign until he puts all enemies beneath his feet. The conflict rages here as it does not rage in any other department of the universe known to man. How sad a thought it is that, of all the creatures of God, man alone is vile ! All other subjects are true in their allegiance to the throne of God. The earth revolves, the sun shines, and the water rushes on to the sea—all obedient to his word. It is only when God asks man to surrender to his Son, and place himself under his government, that there is rebellion. There is not a world in any department of space ; there is not an ocean, sea, river, or continent ; there is not a tree, shrub, flower, or breath of fragrance ; there is not an insect in the sunbeam, nor an archangel in his presence, that exists not in perfect harmony with his will. Earth lies like an apple in the hollow of his hand ; hell trembles at the fierceness of his wrath ; heaven rejoices in the light of his countenance. And when from his throne of universal empire he proclaims himself "I am that I am," all his works are swift to own his sovereign sway, and joyfully confess, "Thou art, and all things are of thee."

It is not, then, in any such sense as this that we pray "thy kingdom come." In every other respect the kingdom of God *has* come, and is now spread out in all its glorious amplitude, embracing all things animate and inanimate. But the kingdom of grace has not so come. Its light has not been diffused to such an extent that it has

penetrated all the dark abodes of sin and death. There are whole nations who to-day sit in the dark night of heathen superstition, and myriads of our race over whose path the radiance of Bethlehem's star has never yet fallen ! So long then as it is written, "You must be born again ;" so long as man's moral nature needs to be regenerated ; so long as the subjects of the kingdom of grace are susceptible of more perfect development, and are hence capable of rising to a higher and better life than they are now living ; so long as there is one sinner unconverted, or one saint unsanctified ; so long will we have need for the petition, "thy kingdom come."

The kingdom of God—or, that which amounts to the same, the Church of Christ—is composed of accountable persons who severally and individually enjoy the reign of Christ in their hearts. Next in importance to the work of their personal salvation, they are solicitous for the salvation of others ; they therefore labor faithfully, in order that they may be instrumental in bringing others into the same gracious reign and privileges in Christ. In this work they pray for the success of the means which they employ, and they most ardently desire that all men may be brought within the sphere of those influences which through Christ promise spiritual life and salvation. Even a great apostle, speaking for himself and his coadjutors, said to the saints of primitive times : "Brethren, pray for us, *that the word of the Lord may have free course and be glorified.*" The words which I have here emphasized explain the philosophy of the second petition.

The Bible contains the only authoritative exposition of the laws and ordinances of the kingdom of Christ. In the exact ratio, then, of its dissemination, and the joyful reception of its truths in the hearts of men, will the kingdom of the Messiah extend and over all prevail. Whenever, therefore, a Christian labors in propagating the gospel, he practically prays, "thy kingdom come."

The extent to which the gospel succeeded in bringing men to Christ indicated, in the minds of the apostles, the precise boundaries of the Redeemer's kingdom. They only changed the lines when the gospel made new conquests and won new trophies. When any city, nation, or individual was converted to Christ, was incorporated within the limits of his kingdom, such city, nation, or individual was said to have received the word of God. The following passages may serve as illustrations of this truth : "Now when the apostles who were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John." Receiving the word of God is explained by their believing the gospel that Philip preached, and being baptized, both men and women. Again : "The apostles and brethren who were in Judæa, heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God." This statement is explained by the simple fact recorded in the tenth chapter of Acts, namely, Peter preached the gos-

pel to the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius, and when they received his message he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Once more : "The word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly, and a great company of the priests became obedient to the faith." In the light of what we have said above, this fine passage so fully explains itself as to require nothing beyond its simple citation. Finally, on this head : When Christianity was introduced into the city of Ephesus, or, in other words, when the kingdom of Christ had extended until it embraced the city of Ephesus, what is said to have produced this result? Hear it : "So mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed."

The word of God must be disseminated. It must be printed, and read, and preached, until every creature shall hear the glad tidings. It must be placed in the hands of all men, that they may acquaint themselves with the sublime principles of Christ's spiritual kingdom, and then in turn teach them to their children. This is the light that streams from the sun of righteousness, the harbinger of the reign of peace and good-will among men. We meditate upon this gospel, and the mind is enlarged. It speaks to our hopes, and they mount to the throne of God. We breathe its spirit, and our passions are subdued. As a merciful scheme, it is the sum of infinite wisdom. As a means of releasing poor sinners from the bondage of sin, its power is omnipotent. "Oh, the depths of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out !" To my mind there is nowhere else, among all the works of his hands, such a display of his wisdom and power. Not in the balancing of the clouds, not in the measured march of the armies of the sky, not in the eternal throbbings of the ocean's bosom, not in vegetation, with all its fairy forms of life and beauty, not in animal creation, with its tissue of nerve, and vein, and sinew, not in any of these, or all of these, do I behold such an exhibition of love and wisdom as when by faith I see the Son of God hanging on the cross—a sacrifice to heaven's justice, and an atonement for the world's guilt. But Christ will avail the sinner nothing, his kingdom will not and can not prevail, unless the gospel is faithfully preached. "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? *And how shall they preach except they be sent?*" The clause of the sentence which I have placed in italics brings me to my concluding thought, and to the end of my paper, already too long.

I believe the faithful, honest preaching of the gospel to be one of the standing ordinances of the kingdom of God, and that nothing else can, by any means or to any extent displace or supersede it, except at the loss and detriment of the kingdom. Let us have fewer col-

leges, and better ones ; fewer papers, and better ones ; fewer discussions about how to do it, and let us all strike out vigorously and do it, and the result will far surpass our wildest expectations. We are entirely too sensitive as to the manner in which some things shall be done. Now I care not who preaches the gospel, nor how he is sustained, nor anything about it, just so he preaches it ! The gospel is as true, and as good, and as powerful, and as much the gospel in the mouth of the devil as in the mouth of Peter. Let us look to it that we spread it, and not waste so much time in talking about how to spread it. Paul says : "Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife ; and some also of good-will. The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds ; but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defense of the gospel. What then ? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached ; and I therein do rejoice, yes, and will rejoice." Christ is preached ; that was the one great fact at which the apostle looked. I wonder if this is scriptural ?

In praying, then, "thy kingdom come," we pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth more laborers into his vineyard. The hearts of men must be disposed by our heavenly Father to work his righteous will. But it is not enough that they be sent forth. "Every good and perfect gift comes from the Father." We therefore pray that the men whom we send forth on this errand of mercy may be successful. Paul may plant, Apollos may water, but it is God who causes to grow. But the planting and watering must be done ! God does not cause corn to grow where none was planted. We must not, however, in praying for these things, forget the nature of prayer. Its nature is that of vows and sacrifices. A true prayer, therefore, is a vow joined with a sacrifice. I vow to promote the glory of God when I pray for the coming of his kingdom ; but with this vow I join a contribution of work or money, or both, to assist in bringing about the result for which I pray. Hence, when we pray that the Bible may be placed in the hands of all men, we make a vow, and join the vow with a sacrifice to God, that to the extent of our ability it shall be so. So when we pray for preachers to be sent out to preach the gospel to the perishing millions around us, along with our prayers we send our sacrifices. In this way alone will the present corps of preachers be augmented. The angel informed the Roman officer that his charitable deeds, as well as his prayers, had risen to God. God often makes us the instruments by which he answers our own prayers. He commands us to pray for our daily bread, and then he commands us to plow and sow seed, in order that the prayers may be answered. Thus he feeds the millions who cry to him for food, through the sacrifice and patient toil of the laborer.

Christ must reign till he has put all enemies under his feet ; and

when all things shall be subdued to him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all. But this universal sovereignty has not yet been attained. By this I mean that all men are not Christians, and that all Christians are not what they should be. Even in this heaven-favored land there are whole families outside the pale of the kingdom. There are also large districts where the gospel has never yet been preached. Now these families must be converted, these districts must be evangelized. A mighty effort must be made to make them allegiant to the throne of the Prince Messiah.

Then there are whole nations without the gospel. Notwithstanding the fact that Christ has been preached—that he rose from the dead—for more than eighteen centuries, it nevertheless remains true that there are to-day whole nations destitute of the gospel. The widow is still burned upon the funeral pyre of her husband; the infant still supplies food for the ravenous monsters of the sacred river; and the horrid rites of Juggernaut are still celebrated as of yore. Truly, we have need to pray "thy kingdom come." But something is being done. Thank God, something is being done! With all the halting, and complaining, and doubting, that characterize many of our fellow-laborers, still something is being done. The gospel is now published in more than two hundred dialects of this babbling earth. The majority of the nations are at least beginning to see faint traces of the dawn—the harbinger of the coming day. The idolater of the Ganges and the savage of the Pacific isle, the cannibal wanderer beneath the torrid zone and the fur-clad son of the frozen North, have alike beheld the radiance of that far-streaming glory that is yet to fill the world. W.

THE FOREGOING.—In the form of a suggestion I crave leave to question whether W. is right in all he says of the petition, "thy kingdom come." That he is right in many things I thoroughly believe, but think him wrong in his main conclusion. I therefore hope he will reconsider his reasoning; and I add with pleasure, that I know of no one more ready than he, when convinced, to retract an error. The petition "thy kingdom come" refers to a *fact*, a single fact, and not to a series, nor a process. That fact had its occurrence and completion in the setting up of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost. Never since then has the prayer been pertinent. I can not pray "thy kingdom come;" but I profoundly can, thy "everlasting kingdom" come. For that fact I give thanks, for this pray.—Ed.

OUR MODE OF PREACHING.

Of all the callings known to me none is so imperfectly understood as preaching. With many it is the only calling wholly free from care—a life of rest, of dignified ease, and painless luxury. Nothing could be more erroneous than this. No other calling pursued by man imposes burdens more numerous, none burdens so weighty. No responsibilities are so heavy as those of the preacher; and where else can duties be found of a nature so delicate, and requiring in their performance so much skill? A few thoughts on the calling I think urgently called for, and these not simply for the benefit of the occupants of the pew, but equally for that of the occupants of the pulpit.

That the best talents of earth should be consecrated to the preaching of the gospel is with me nothing below a truism. Not that it should not be pleaded by humble talents, but only that certainly the best should be devoted to it. We want the gospel preached by every rank of men, by him who has one talent, by him who has ten, but especially by the latter. For all these men God has work, and requires each to do it. Our motto is, Let every man work in his sphere, and each up to the measure of his ability. Then will God's work be done, never till then. For the humble preacher of one talent God has laid off a little nook in his great field, and into that little nook requires him to thrust his sickle. If he fail, the Lord will not acquit him. Then let not his small work be despised. Rather let him be honored for it, and the more because he is willing to do it, though small. Against these modest workers I often hear brethren speaking in a way which hurts me much, in a way which I feel to be little else than cruel. Cavalierly they are talked of as "never preaching anything but faith, repentance, and baptism." Dear men, how I honor them for knowing even this much of Christ's most precious truth, and for faithfully preaching what they know. Would that all others did so much, especially their critics. Because they know only faith, repentance, and baptism, and hence can not preach more, shall they therefore not preach at all? How, then, shall they ever render an account to Him who will require "mine own, with the usury thereon?" Brethren are very inconsiderate sometimes in their criticisms, and wound where, because least deserved, it gives keenest pain. Gently speak of him who toils through life with his lone talent, doing his Master's will as best he can, despite of your unkind comments. Your own account may be more difficult to adjust than his.

Certainly the man who has one talent can not accomplish so much, as he who has five or ten. These, therefore, we want in the field

not because they are more lovely, but because they till a greater breadth. That work we would not neglect, still less this. The man whose broad intellect and noble heart can impress a whole State with the truth, may certainly be more highly considered than he whose little neighborhood alone has felt his presence ; but he is not therefore to be more gently spoken of or tenderly loved. I admire greatly the towering forest oak, but fondly look on the fragile shrub which lends me the fragrance of its rose. Let no uncivil critiques tear his feelings to whom God has seen fit to confide but a single talent.

But we live in an age of great mental activity, in an age when the champions of error are giants in intellect and scholarship. To meet and vanquish these, and still maintain the truth high above danger, we need great masters in the art of preaching ; and to have these we require men of strong, bright intellects ; men of commanding learning, deep glowing thought, and never-flagging energy. We need men whose hearts are sweet and fathomless with love, and whose whole natures are mellowed with piety ; men whose spirits have been broken with grief, and in whom stand great wells of sympathy for sinning ruined man. We want men who can brush error from the soul with a hand velvety as the down itself ; and who yet, when need so demands, can sabre down the haughty foe of truth with a blade broad, keen, and irresistible ; men whose art in logic shall be unmatched ; whose witching manner, and subtle, overpowering persuasion shall bear down all before it to the will of Christ ; men from whose lips truth distills, sparkling as it falls like drops of dew, and who still can clothe it in words a child can understand. These are the men the age and the cause we plead demand. But still we need others. The man of nine talents stands just one degree below him who has ten. Him, therefore, we need. He fills a niche in God's great fane no one else can fill, can do a work which must forever remain undone without him. We can not do without the man of nine talents ; and so on with the man of eight, the man of seven, and on over the whole scale to unity. We must have them all, and will despise none. Because the man with one talent can not work so magnificently as he who has ten, we will not condemn the man with one, nor deify the man with ten. We will look on all as gifts from God, will adore our bountiful Benefactor, and endeavor, in humility, so to use his gifts that he will, not only not shut his gracious hand against us, but will bless us still beyond all we can ask or think.

But how shall we command the men of whom we speak ? How bring them into the field ; and how keep them there when in it ? These are grave questions. I wish I had an answer to them. It must be confessed, deep as is our sorrow while making it, that the church holds out few incentives to men of talents, in the present day, to become ministers in her holy things. Indeed, beyond the solitary prospect of

doing good, I do not see that she is holding out even one. Rather does she not deter from her fields than invite into them? I believe it is so; but let us see. A preacher is ambitious to become eminent in his calling, "a workman that need not be ashamed;" he has talents, and is conscious of them; these he wants to strengthen and polish by every means which books and thought can supply. He loves Christ with an absorbing love, and longs to see his name glorified in the earth to the widest possible extent. Over fallen humanity he profoundly mourns, and yearns to contribute whatever may be in his power to save it. What prospect opens up to this man in the church? Is it a decent living for self and family, with a little cot he can call mine, in which to die when his work is done? Is it a library, even respectable in the variety and number of its volumes? No such prospects as these promise even to reward him should he engage to preach. On the contrary, unless he is an exception to a general rule, he may with certainty count on being through life homeless as the beasts of the jungle. Never during his career may he expect to be able, more than once, should his horse lie down and die, to replace him without going in debt; and as for books, especially such as are suitable, he never need look for more of these than he can carry in a common valise. As proof, in part at least, of what I am saying, I jot down the two following cases:

One day while I lived in Georgetown, this State, an aged preacher sat by my hearth. He was venerable for his years, and venerable for his almost unequalled work in his Master's cause. He told me himself he kept count till he had immersed with his own hands over six thousand human beings. He was infirm with age and very sad. His head was white, exceeding white; his beard was long and gray. His clothes were poor, almost mean. His spirits were low, his heart was bitter; very bitter. He thus discoursed: "My brother, I have been a true man; I have preached the true gospel of Jesus Christ, and never have I faltered. Through life I have wrought on scanty fare, yet with fidelity have I wrought. I am now old and infirm; my work is done; destitute I bring it to an end. My grief is great, for I am in want. Here I am on the edge of the grave, forgotten and neglected by my brethren. Even by my God I seem to be deserted. What shall I do? In the anguish of my spirit, for it is great, I have sometimes thought of suicide." My soul! did these ears ever hear that piteous tale?" "Suicide!" ah, that is the word I so quickly caught, and which still hangs like a death-bell in my ear. But of my emotions and feelings I do not propose to give any account. The reader is left to conjecture these.

While I now write, and within less than one mile of where I write, there stays an infirm brother many miles from home. He is traveling to acquaint the brethren with his wants, and to ask of them the boon

which, as a just reward for a life of labor in Christ, has been denied to him. His name is indelicately paraded over the country in our public prints, and his wants and circumstances discussed as flip-pantly as if he were some new popular invention just coming into notice. He is not yet heavy with years, but is much wasted by disease ; he has done a work for Christ, of which all speak with pleasure, and many with pride and exultation. By all he is highly considered ; by many, tenderly loved. Yet when his infirm and over-wrought body should be enjoying a little rest in a quiet spot he could call home, he is far from wife and pets literally asking for bread. Is this a prospect to entice young men of fine intellects and noble natures into the field as preachers ? Perhaps so. But why, I shall be asked, have I alluded to these two cases ? My reasons are two. First, to appeal to my brethren, in the name of Christ and of humanity, to see to it that their preachers are not reduced to these extremities. Brethren, have we not reached a point in our history when a change is demanded in the circumstances of our public men ? Shall these faithful servants of God longer go neglected as they have heretofore been ? Should you dwell in palaces, while they toil through life houseless ? Shall your broad table groan beneath the weight of luxuries, while they, on scanty boards, eat their small fare in gratitude and tears ? Is this right ? Lay the question to your hearts in the sight of Him who is searching you to the bottom, and will sift you as wheat. Your preachers do not ask for wealth, but *enough* God has appointed as their reward. Are you keeping it back ? If so, better for you that all the armies of the North and of the South were on your fields, and all the frogs and lice of Egypt in your beds. I pray you not utterly to deter young brethren from the field by the poverty in which you are suffering your aged preachers to end life. Young men are disheartened by these sights. They are overwhelmed by the prospect of probable want while yet young, and of beggary when old. Surely we have a right to expect the change we ask.

Second : I want to dissuade our editors from publishing the wants and sorrows of these men all over the land to their own exquisite pain and our scandal as a people. That this is done from the kindest motives and most benevolent feelings I thoroughly know. Still, surely it is not right. In the first place, it does little good. Last winter while lying sick, and living daily on borrowed money for three months, a brotherly editor, in the generousness of his nature and sympathy of his heart, called the attention of the brotherhood to my case, and asked for a thousand additional subscribers to the *Quarterly* and a little fraternal relief in the form of greenbacks. Toward my brother I could have no feelings but those of gratitude and kindness for his act. But what did it amount to ? It brought me ten dollars from New Orleans and one subscriber from Illinois—not one cent more

nor another name. Thus his appeal was wasted on insensible hearts ; the space in his paper lost ; and my own head made to go down in shame. The sum received multiplied a hundred times could not have compensated me for the pain the notice gave. No ; when I am allowed to come to want, let God and my wife know the secret, but none others through the press. Nobly should we remember the poor ; but in ministrations to their wants the left hand must not know what the right does.

If efforts are to be made to purchase a home for a brother, let no publication be made of the fact through the papers. By all means let the home be bought ; but bring the matter to the ears of the brethren in some other more effectual way. Printing it will fail. Even brethren read these notices with too cold an ear. They rarely bring relief. Let some active man, kind in heart, take the matter in hand, and set out to raise the required sum by visiting brethren personally, and making a direct appeal to each. As a general rule, he will raise more money in this way in one church than can be raised in ten by printing. Thus those painful wants of the children of God will be kept from an unappreciating world, and the cause will be saved from scandal.

I am profoundly anxious to see the very finest young men of the land in the field as preachers. But till more ample provision has been made to meet their wants, is it right to invite them in ? Is it just—just to them or just in itself ? It will not do to talk prettily of providence and of the goodness of God. Providence and the goodness of God never yet supported a preacher in a community of illiberal brethren. Where brethren withhold, providence is stringent. It is cheap talk to tell a young man to go forth nobly to the work, trusting in God. Certainly we must not distrust God ; but God has ordained that they who preach the gospel shall thereby live. He will support them in no other way. Neither will he work a miracle to make men liberal. When Christians do nothing, the Lord does nothing, except to hold them guilty. Depend on this, whatever is done for preachers has to be done by the brethren, else it will not be done at all. God has placed his treasure in their hands, and expects them to dispense it. There remains to us no other source.

That one of the surest methods of effecting the end of which I speak would be to place in the field the men we need, I well know. The men themselves would create the supply of their wants. At least would they do this to some extent. But how shall young men be made to see this ? Till they do see it they can not consent to preach. Here lies the difficulty. The truth is, that, by our greatly increased liberality and by our better provision for our preachers, we must give them a guaranty that they will be properly cared for. Then shall we induce them to undertake the work, not before.

But I have suffered myself to be led a long way into a ramble not thought of when I sat down to the present task. More especially was it my purpose to speak of the work of preachers, and not of the work of others. To this duty, therefore, I now address myself.

The time was when as a people we talked much of the "ancient order of things." I am sorry that we should have grown somewhat silent on the topic. Let us now amend a little. "I taught you," says Paul, "*publicly and from house to house.*" This was clearly the ancient order as to teaching. I wish it were the modern. On it we must not even hope to improve. At present I speak not of public teaching, but of teaching from house to house. Teaching publicly is the noblest of arts, but teaching from house to house is the perfection of teaching. Never will our preachers accomplish the whole volume of good they are capable of till they fully inaugurate this system. To do this changes will be necessary.

We must utterly abandon our old routine of monthly preaching. It was always a bad system ; now it is intolerable. It holds the place of something incomparably better, to which it should be sternly required to give place. In time gone *possibly* it was necessary ; now it is worse than useless. Against it, as an expedient of the past, I have nothing to say. Brethren transplanted it from the sects into the kingdom of God at a time when they saw not clear enough to do better. It is an exotic. We have fully tried it, and found it to yield little else than bad fruit. The time has fully come when it should be banished the realm as an evil weed. To get rid of it will cost us some trouble ; and, it may be, give some pain. For that we should feel ready ; but this let us prevent to the full extent of our power. In effecting the change, if possible, let the feelings of none be wounded. Especially let us show ourselves tenderly regardful of the feelings of the venerable men who chiefly still practice the system. If possible, let us not only not give them pain, but try to entice them into a more excellent way.

Our whole system of congregational education must undergo a change. But I must drop general terms and enter into details.

On settling with a church the first thing a preacher should do is to get a full list of the names of all its members. With these members he should immediately become acquainted, so as to be able to speak readily the name of each at sight. In meeting his flock, courtesy and kindness should characterize his manner. Haughtiness and coldness should be studiously avoided ; but above all, too great familiarity. Nothing is more disgusting than vulgar intimacy ; nor does anything destroy sooner the influence of a preacher. Neither allow it nor practice it. Greet all the senior or married members of the body by their surnames. Never use their given names. Do not say Brother John, Brother Joe, Sister Jane. This is intolerable. In turn you will

soon become Brother Bob or Brother Sam. Now, while I do not want my brethren to be shy of me, I do not want to be Bobbed or Sammed. Dignity is in the surname ; it must hence always be used. Let this be pronounced with fullness, and precisely as the family pronounce it. Take no liberties with it ; and pay no attention to how neighbors pronounce it. They are often wrong. The family know their name ; and courtesy makes them the law in pronouncing it. It is gentler to call the junior members by their given names. A different course is stiff and finikin. By some it is held as a mark of breeding, but it is clearly a mark of the want of it. The given name is more paternal, and better comports with the relation an affectionate preacher bears to the "little ones" for whom he cares.

Some preachers are very fond of kissing one sex of their flock ; but it is very curious that, though moved to their affectionate act purely by their love of Christ, they never kiss the other sex, nor do they ever thus fondly greet the aged sisters. These men, no doubt, are very amorous and very suspicious, and are quite right in evincing how in Christ they do love *certain* sheep of the fold. Still I would advise all such preachers to refrain from kissing, and all churches of Christ to refrain from such preachers.

It will be well for a preacher on beginning his labors with a church not to promise too much. If he fails, it will be to him a consolation to know that, at least, he has broken no pledges. Do much and promise little is an excellent rule. Great pretensions justly lead us to expect but small results ; and it is ludicrous to create large expectations, and do nothing. Modesty holds out no great inducements, but meets the occasion. This is better.

In speaking of your predecessor be cautious. Never find fault with him ; and even where you deem him wrong say nothing. Preachers never promote themselves by speaking against preachers. Let your conduct indicate your views, not your words. If his brethren speak against him, give them no countenance. Tatling is not of Christ. Neither allow yourself to be flattered by contrasts drawn in which your conduct is lauded and his faulted. His failures may have been due to interference from false brethren. Be shy how you commit yourself to people till you know them.

Where you deem changes necessary in a congregation introduce them as imperceptibly as possible. Innovations, as such, are not popular ; and brethren feel themselves reflected upon when you pronounce their past life wrong. Abrupt changes will breed suspicion and lead to talk. Avoid these. Suggest alterations, but never command them. An imperious manner alienates and excites opposition. Gentleness and love will effect what authority never can. Your brethren will delight to please you where you ask it ; they will decline where you demand it.

Keep all your plans to yourself ; and let the church learn them only as you unfold them in practice. Many a man fails by telling beforehand what he is going to do. Your views, as such, if expressed at once, will be criticised. Shun this. The members of a church, as a general rule, are poor critics. They are respectable at fault-finding, but fail in criticism. Further : plans in the abstract are appreciated by few. It is only when seen in actual operation that their value is felt. Hence it is better to withhold them till you can thus manifest them. A comment on a plan working well can be understood by all, and will be at once received, whereas a previous explanation will be unsatisfactory.

In managing a church, work up to your strength ; but in talk, reserve much unsaid. The tongue at last has to repeat itself, but the path of action is ever varying. When your resources fail, of whatever kind, you will become contemptible. Carefully, then, watch the fountain which is the soonest to run dry. With a repeated act we are never dissatisfied, with a repeated thought never pleased. On the contrary, a recurring act often gives pleasure ; but a returning thought never.

With the members of your flock your acquaintance must be thorough. You must know their minds, know their hearts, know their lives. Without this knowledge you will be constantly blundering. You will often wound where it is unjust, and praise where you should censure. The appearance men put on is not always the fact to which we should speak. Behind this often lies the real circumstance demanding our attention ; and till you do know men, beware how you speak to them or of them. Pertinent speech is a rare art for a preacher. Study to speak to the real, not to the apparent state of the case.

Of course, your great whole work respects your brethren as Christians. Two comprehensive generalizations will both include and exhaust this work—enlightenment and action. Now your first concern will be as to enlightenment. By every means in your power, not forbidden by Christianity, must you carry forward the education of the disciples in the Holy Scriptures. Your failure to do this will be fatal. Neglect here is the great ruining sin of the age. As soon as the children of God begin to neglect the minute and exhaustive study of his word, their theory of Christianity will begin to become dim. This dimness will first show itself on the far outer edges of the kingdom. Gradually it will extend toward the centre. As this neglect increases, the dimness will deepen. The shadows of night, thin at first, will imperceptibly thicken as they grow longer. If the neglect still go on, on still will grow the shadows. Thus an eclipse of the glorious light of the gospel becomes not a violent future improbability. Already it has once occurred. We look for it again. By perseverance and great energy we may postpone indefinitely its return ; but it will come.

You will see to it that each member of the body is engaged in the daily reading and study of the truth. No abatement must be allowed to occur. By every stimulant which ingenuity can suggest must you keep up this work. He who habitually neglects the study of God's word is never safe ; he who habitually studies it is never very unsafe. By all means, then, have that word studied. Have it studied in the family circle, in the social circle, in the Sunday school ; but especially have it studied by each member individually and privately. Reading the Scriptures is good ; but reading them in the popular way is not enough. By reading them, we imbibe their spirit ; by studying them, collect their thought. The thought becomes the rule of action, the spirit determines its manner. Hence both are indispensable. But in collecting thought we are active ; in imbibing spirit, passive. Hence that is difficult, this is easy. Both are equally necessary. The difference lies in acquiring them. Both must have the constant attention of the preacher. On these will depend the power of his church for good, and in them certainly will consist its happiness. In a lovely spirit, in bright, divine thought, and action strictly conformed thereto, consists the perfection of Christianity.

To be profitable, the study of the Holy Scriptures must be severe, protracted, and minute. This will prevent our attempting to master too much at one lesson. Than this, nothing can be more injurious. Vague general views of large sections are of little value. A single verse thoroughly studied is worth a whole book carelessly read. To render this work successful, the preacher himself must take the lead in it. He must be both pupil and teacher. As pupil, he must be the example ; as teacher, must guide the labors of others. He must himself be the illustration of his plans. He will sit down with his brethren and actually show them how the Scriptures are to be studied. Each word he will trace to its root, and thus obtain its original meaning. He will then point out its usage at the present time, especially its usage in the New Testament. He will show how to gather the scope of a passage ; and then which meaning of a word this scope requires. Thus he will teach how the sense of Scripture is unfolded and brought out. Every member of his church he will keep constantly at this work. At first this will be difficult, but habit will render it easy. For a long time progress will be slow ; but the faithful preacher, having first determined that his work is right, will never falter in it. He will sow seed this year to be reaped ten hence. He is a philosopher who can do this.

A very large proportion of his whole time the preacher should spend in visiting the members of his flock. These visits should not be mere fashionable calls. Such visits usually discriminate between the rich and the poor ; and just in so far as they do this they are injurious. The preacher's visits should be visits with an object ; visits full of

heart, and looking to the well-being of those whom he serves. Otherwise they are simply fruitless of good. These visits should be short and frequent. In each, be sure to accomplish something. Never permit a failure. Right action should be the great end of these visits, not simply right in a single item, but universally right. But let each visit look to a single act. Should you attempt too much, you are almost certain to fail. Do one thing at a time, and do that well, is one of the soundest maxims in the world. Of course, each member, like patients down with different diseases, will require a different treatment. With one, the object will be to cure an evil habit of speech ; with another, an evil temper ; with a third, remissness in attending church. Much skill and delicacy will here be required. The attempted cure is a reflection on the former life. This may induce irritation and ill feeling. In this event you can effect but little. Keep the spirit mellow and kind when faults are to be remedied. In all cases it will be well to precede your work with prayer. Take the party aside whom you propose to benefit ; explain to him that the object of your visit is his happiness as a Christian ; then bow with him in fervent prayer. This will becalm his spirit and subdue his heart. Now strike. This is the golden moment. Let your own spirit be imbued with the profoundest love and tenderness. Your cure may not at first be complete, but you will not often fail to make an impression. Follow up this impression before it is lost. Deepen it by repetition, till success, complete success, crowns your effort. Your own joy will now be great indeed.

The whole routine of Christian life will thus be called up and made the subject of special thought and teaching. Never consent that your congregation shall be simply respectable. This is a relative position, and may be infinitely bad. The standard you must rear for your church is positive, not relative. It is that laid down in the New Testament. Compromise on no ground below this standard. Nobly work for the proud elevation. Failure will then be the fault of others, not yours. Literally, you must teach your flock everything. You must teach them how to read, how to think, how to speak, how to pray, how to get, how to give—in a word, how to do, and what to do ; how to be, and what to be. This you can never do successfully from the public stand. From house to house alone can you do this. A church taught merely from the pulpit will never be aught else than neither cold nor hot. I never knew an exception to this statement. Teaching from the pulpit may mold the thought ; but it is teaching from house to house which molds the action. Hence the two are the complement and perfection of teaching. Neither can be dispensed with ; but of the two, the latter is now the great necessity, both with our preachers and in our churches. The former we have respectably tried, but with us as a people the latter is a thing whose efficacy is

yet to be tested. The sooner the test is made, the safer will it be for the churches of Christ.

Teaching from house to house has another advantage over teaching publicly. It affords an opportunity of actually exemplifying many of life's most important duties. One great aim of the true preacher is to induce all the members of his flock to pray. To accomplish this he will find one of his greatest difficulties. Lectures from the pulpit will achieve but little. The closet is the place to effect this. Let each member, if his life is not already thoroughly known, be asked the question when alone and in the proper mood, Are you accustomed to pray each morning and each night? If the reply is no, you now have work to do. With this reply you must never rest satisfied. You must have a different life and a different reply. Take this brother into the closet and actually teach him how to pray. Why not? Do we not teach our children by actual example how to work arithmetic, how to read, and even how to hoe? And is prayer less important than these? By actual example we teach our children how to walk, how to sit, how to talk, how to ride, and how to bow, and is prayer of less value than these? Our daughters are taught how to make butter, soup, and tea, but never how to pray. They are taught how to make toast, curls, and lace, and how to grace a parlor, but never how to grace a closet and commune with God. Is this right? Few will say yes. I repeat, then, take this brother into the closet. Explain to him your object in the tenderest manner possible. Then request him to bow with you, and make him actually repeat after you a prayer. Let it be very brief, say the following: Our Father in heaven, have mercy on me, forgive my sins, give me my daily bread, keep me from temptation, and save me at last. Amen. Ask him to repeat this morning and night till his own soul compels him to make enlargements, and till a habit has been formed. His case is not far from hopeless if he declines. Explain to him that length has nothing to do with the value of a prayer, and how it is that even the shortest may be the best. Thus will you be bringing up the child of God in the way in which he should walk. He will not depart from it when old. Besides, nothing inspires a people with so much affection for a preacher as this species of intercourse with them. They know it to be right, and respect the heart that seeks to bring them to it. Other illustrations might be adduced of what I here mean, but for the present this must suffice. A few hints is all I can now drop.

But in the present article I propose merely to inaugurate a topic. Its amplification must follow when we are ready for it. Enough has been said for one lesson.

EFFICACY OF THE ATONEMENT.

WHEN Paul affirmed the gospel to be "the power of God unto salvation," he assigned the following reason: "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed," etc. A clear exposition of this last declaration, he subsequently gave in the following paragraph: "The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference, for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God has set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness; that he might be just and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus." (Romans iii., 21-26.)

Thus "the righteousness of God" is that wonderful display of his own justification while extending justification to the sinner; the ground upon which he can be "just and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus." This implies, of course, that there are circumstances under which he could not justly justify the sinner. This limitation of divine power and restriction upon divine action must be attributed to the fact that moral law is as imperative in the divine as in the human relation. As it is "impossible for God to lie," so every act of his must be in perfect accordance and consistency with his divine character and infinite perfections. This, then, is not, as some affirm, elevating the moral law of God above himself, and subjecting him to the sway of a foreign authority, but only representing him as a law unto himself. When he is represented as limited in the sphere of his action, the limitation must be thought of as flowing from the excellency of his own divine attributes, and not from any foreign necessity or outside compulsion.

Here we see the difference in the two relations which God on the one hand and man on the other sustain to the divine law. Man is bound to make justice the rule of his action, because it descends to him from an absolute and independent source of authority; while God must respect the same divine law simply because it is a part of his own being, and he is unchangeable. Suppose now that man disregards the relation which he sustains to the moral law, and ignores the obligation thence arising, violating it in its specific requirements; what results? It becomes impossible for God himself to im-

pute righteousness to him until some provision can be made for the manifestation of his own righteousness or justification before the law while bestowing this blessing upon man. To deny the necessity for this provision supposes either that God may disregard the claims of his own law, or that man is not guilty of its infraction. The first supposition destroys the immutability of God, and the second belies the history and experience of man. God is unchangeable in his attributes ; the moral law is but the reflection of these ; man is in antagonism with the moral law ; therefore a union between God and man is impossible, until the law can be sanctified in humanity. How now is this brought about? What provision has been made? "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us." Hence, in the passage already quoted, God is represented as setting forth his Son as "a propitiation to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins, that he might be just and the justifier of him that believes in Jesus."

This provision for justification through Christ, this "propitiation" for sin, is commonly called "the atonement." By it man is rendered pardonable. Let us briefly consider this effect. It is supposed by many that the atonement is the payment of an immense debt by the "legally responsible Surety" of Adam's insolvent children. Now a debt which is paid can never be remitted. Pardon, then, is impossible, and man attains to a strictly "legal justification." *Reductio ad absurdum.* The theory is erroneous. Sin is not a debt, but a crime. The atonement is not a commercial, but a moral transaction. It does not procure immediately man's release, but only the possibility of his release. Hence both expiation and pardon are necessary, and any theory of the atonement which subverts either the one or the other is false.

This will enable us to understand the nature of the justification attainable through the atonement. The only sense in which the law, any law, can justify, is to establish the innocence of the party justified, and as mankind are "all under sin," it is clear that no one can be justified in any such sense. The law never justifies the guilty ; but the Scriptures represent God as justifying the ungodly. Legal justification is, therefore, one thing, and scriptural justification quite another. The law sanctions or approves the life of all whom it justifies ; but when God is said to "justify the ungodly," we are not to suppose that he justifies them in their ungodliness or approbates their ungodly life, but rather that he justifies them from their ungodliness, *i. e.*, pardons their ungodliness through the provisions of the atonement, and accounts them, though guilty, as innocent and righteous. "Even as David also describes the blessedness of the man

unto whom God imputes righteousness without works, saying : Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Before making this quotation from David, the apostle had used the term justification as equivalent to the imputation of righteousness, and this last phrase he uses in the quotation as equivalent to the non-imputation of sin, the forgiveness of iniquity. Pardon and scriptural justification are, therefore, identical. We are "justified freely by grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Clearly, then, we are justified through the forgiveness of sins.

What wondrous efficacy of the atonement is this through which the guilty are treated as innocent without violence to the claims of the immutable law which pronounces them guilty? Yes, a great work, indeed, responds a learned doctor—an indispensable work, without which the soul would utterly perish ; yet man must be sanctified as well as justified. The subject begins at once to be a little cloudy. Salvation from sin, we are told, consists of two parts, with one of which the atonement has nothing to do, notwithstanding the apostle expressly declares the gospel to be "the power of God for salvation to every believer," and then immediately ascribes, as we have seen, its efficacy to the atonement therein revealed.

We here encounter a theory which lies at the foundation of all those systems of theology which teach the necessity of extra spiritual influences in the conversion and salvation of men. The theory is this : While the atonement secures the forgiveness of sins, there is, in addition to this, a moral defilement, cleaving inwardly to the human soul, which the efficacy of the atonement can not reach. Note the following : "Does the blood of Christ purify the heart? The atonement secures the remission of sins, but does the Bible teach that it takes away depravity? The very idea is absurd. There is not a word in the Bible to countenance such a notion." (*Lexington Debate*, p. 660.)

If there is an additional stain adhering to the soul after the remission of guilt is secured through the blood of Christ, some additional agency is, of course, called into requisition for its removal, and hence the doctrine of an inward spiritual operation wrought upon the naked soul of man, in order to cleanse it from this moral disorder. Now if such a cleansing, sanctifying, or purifying operation is properly the work of the Holy Spirit, then there ought at least to be no controversy as to the manner in which this work is to be effected, for it could be done in no other way than by a direct exertion of power to that end. Accordingly, we must maintain, in opposition to the common understanding, that the real difference between those who advocate and those who reject the doctrine before us is not a difference

as to the manner of spiritual agency, but a difference as to the work of the spirit. According to the theory stated above, Christ by his blood through the atonement justifies man, while the Holy Spirit sanctifies, purifies, and cleanses the soul ; and while these two divine agents co-operate in the great work of salvation, these are the peculiar offices and legitimate functions of each respectively in contradistinction to the other. The work of the Holy Spirit, in this special relation, is ascribed to him to the exclusion of any agency on the part of Christ, and *vice versa*. Hence the apparent astonishment with which the interrogatory is propounded in the above extract : "Does the blood of Christ purify the heart ?" And hence, too, the emphatic asseveration that "the very idea is absurd ;" that "there is not a word in the Bible to countenance such a notion."

If now we find upon examination that the Bible does "countenance" this "very idea," and actually ascribes to the blood of Christ, to the efficacy of the atonement, the work which the theory under consideration attributes to the exclusive agency of the Holy Spirit, then the theory itself is thereby exploded, and with it, of course, the theological system which is based upon it. Take, then, the following passage : "If the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of a heifer, sprinkling the unclean, sanctifies to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God ?" Here we have a triple antithesis. 1. The blood of animals under the old covenant stands in contrast with the blood of Christ under the new. 2. The former is represented as merely "sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh" (the outward man); the latter as "purging" the inward man, "the conscience," or the heart, as it is called in the following chapter. (See verse 22.) 3. The nature of the service under the old covenant is likewise presented in contrast with that under the new ; the former, a service pertaining to dead works ; the latter, a service which is rendered to the living God.

Now let it be observed that the term here rendered "purge," and that in the preceding clause translated "purifying," are only different forms (the verb and the participle) of the same word in the original, and that the "conscience" is called the "heart" in the same connection, and we have the positive declaration of the inspired word that the blood of Christ does purify the heart, notwithstanding the above emphatic denial that it does. Let it be remembered, likewise, that the theory under consideration makes the work of the atonement consist in a change merely in man's outward relation to the law, called justification, while sanctification is an internal change wrought upon the soul, not through the atonement, but by a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. "The one," says Watson, "implies what God

does for us through his Son ; the other what God works in us by his Spirit." In this view, then, justification is the work of Christ, and wholly external, as effected "for us" through the atonement ; while sanctification, or the purification of the soul, is the work of the Spirit, and purely internal, as wrought "in us" by a special operation. Now how does this appear in the light of the beautiful and bold contrast presented in the antithesis of the paragraph quoted above ? We there learned that, while the agencies and provisions of the old economy effected a purification merely of the outer man, the provisions of the atonement, on the contrary, effects a purification of the inner man, the very work which the theory in question refuses to ascribe to the efficacy of the atonement, and attributes to the influence of an additional agency.

The radical error in the theory we have been considering lies in the supposition of a remaining moral pollution in addition to the sins which are blotted out in the blood of the Redeemer. The soul that has been truly bathed in his blood has no stains of guilt left for the Holy Spirit or anything else to wash away. "The blood of Jesus Christ," says an apostle, "cleanses us from all sin." With this conception the poet sings :

" There is a fountain filled with blood
Pour'd from Immanuel's veins ;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood
Lose all their guilty stains."

Truly, the work of the Holy Spirit in relation to the sinner, according to the Savior's own definition, is to "convince of sin ;" not to cleanse from sin. How absurd, then, to direct the sinner to look and wait for a purification of heart by spiritual influence, when the Spirit's own work is to prevail on the sinner to come to the fountain of purification in Christ, there to "wash his robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb ?"

What we have now said is, perhaps, sufficient to demonstrate to the mind of the thoughtful the futility of that theory which denies that sanctification, as a purification of the sinner's heart, is effected through the atonement, attributing this work to the efficacy of spiritual influence, which has, as we have seen, no such sanctifying power. We speak, in the first place, of sanctification as it relates to the sinner, and thus as distinguished from that progressive work in the Christian life—the "perfecting of holiness in the fear of God," which has also obtained the name of sanctification, with which it is often confounded ; but is, nevertheless, as we shall see, of a totally different nature. And in the second place, we speak of sanctification as an inward purification to distinguish it from the "sanctification of the Spirit" of which the Scriptures speak, and upon which, to prevent misunderstanding, we must now bestow a passing notice. This ex-

pression occurs several times in the Scriptures, and always, as we could easily show, in relation to the Gentiles, and in relation to these as a nation or a people, as we shall see. Paul speaks of himself as "the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit." The rendering here does not present the full force of the original. Paul does not describe himself by the official term which is ordinarily translated "minister," but represents himself as an evangelical priest, officiating through the gospel to the offering up of the Gentiles as a people distinct from the Jews; which offering, he says, had been "sanctified by the Holy Spirit." Evidently there can be no reference here, as some critics suppose, to any "sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts" of individuals—no internal purification of persons; but the external separation and divinely recognized admission of a whole people to the privileges and blessings of the gospel. How this divine recognition was manifested by the Holy Spirit, which constituted the spiritual sanctification of the offering up of the Gentiles as a people, we shall see very soon. Meanwhile we must notice a passage in the beginning of Peter's first epistle of like import to the one just considered. That Peter, in his epistles, was addressing Gentiles principally, if not exclusively, may be gathered from various passages; but particularly from ch. ii., ver. 10, of the first epistle. In the beginning of this letter he speaks of those addressed as "elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." As "the sanctification of the Spirit" here spoken of is "unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus," it is a sanctification which precedes both of these. Now, we have already clearly seen that sanctification, as a purification of the sinner's heart, is obtained through the blood of Christ—that his blood, reaching beyond the outer man, "purges" or purifies the conscience, or the inner man, or, as Paul expresses it in the end of his argument, "sprinkles the heart from an evil conscience." This internal purification then, this inward sanctification as subsequent to "the sanctification of the Spirit," spoken of in the passage before us, is thereby distinguished from it, and hence can not be identified with it. The passage, then, so far from proving that the sinner's heart is purified by the influence of the Holy Spirit, is a strong proof of the contrary. The nature of "the sanctification of the Spirit" here alluded to, as seen in the light of the passage considered before, consists in the external preparation of the Gentiles, as a people, for the reception of the gospel, and an equal participation in its blessings with the Jewish people. This, at the time of its accomplishment, was expressly called a cleansing, or sanctification, in the vague Jewish sense of that term. For when

this fact was set forth in a figure before Peter, in the city of Joppa, he pronounced the offering "unclean," and was corrected by a voice which said : "What God has cleansed that call thou not common or unclean." Accordingly, on entering the house of Cornelius the Gentile, he addressed him as follows : "You know that it is unlawful for a Jew to associate with one of another nation, or to go into his house ; but God has showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean." He was no longer to regard the Gentile as unclean in the sense of being beyond the reach of divine mercy, and totally unfit for the reception and enjoyment of the blessings of Christianity; but that God had consecrated them, as a people, to these privileges. This great fact was manifested in the midst of Peter's discourse before Cornelius and his house, by the miraculous bestowment of the Holy Spirit upon these Gentiles. He was thus supplied with an overwhelming argument, with which he put to silence the Jews who "contested with him" about the matter when he went up to Jerusalem. "Forasmuch," said he, "as God gave them the like gift as unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God ? When they heard these things they held their peace, and glorified God, saying : Then has God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life," *i. e.*, sanctified them "unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus."

Having explained the external "sanctification of the Spirit," as distinguished from the inward sanctification or purification of the sinner's heart, which is due to the efficacy of the atonement, we return to consider the nature of the latter as distinguished from the progressive sanctification in the life of the Christian, which we have affirmed to be of a totally different character. This last is evidently spiritual growth, improvement in the divine life, a gradual laying aside of the faults and imperfections adhering to our humanity, and thereby acquiring greater strength to resist temptation. We are cured by this process of our evil habits, both of mind and body. A mere look may, through habit, defile the imagination, and, engaging the mind in a sinful mood, cause a sinful act to be already committed in the heart. Now by spiritual meditation and prayer the sinful habit may be destroyed, and the evil thence resulting suppressed, thus "perfecting holiness in the fear of God."

Now the purity and the purification of heart obtained through "the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" has reference to the conscience, not the habits of life, either internal or external, and admits not of degrees, but is "forever perfected" in "them that are sanctified" in this way. The conscience may, of course, become defiled many times, but never again by the sins once purged away in the blood of the Redeemer. This "perfection" looks to the past, not the future. Under the law there was "a remembrance made of sins (the

same sins) every year." Hence it "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." But Christ, as a high-priest and "by his own blood," has "obtained eternal redemption" for us. We here perceive the nature of the purification of the conscience. As it remained unclean on account of the "remembrance of sins" held against it, so, on the other hand, it is cleansed or purified when these sins are "remembered no more," or forgiven. And so argues the apostle, for in giving the testimony of the Spirit to the fact that Christ, by one offering, "has forever perfected them that are sanctified," he sums up that testimony in the following promise: "Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." He then adds: "Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." Because those thus "sanctified" are "forever perfected." The apostle, then, in this place uses the terms "sanctification" and "remission" interchangeably. They denote the same great work of the atonement, but present that work in different relations. Sanctification as a purification of the heart, is the remission of sins as seen in its effect upon the conscience of those who are forgiven. A "guilty conscience" is a heart impure. A conscience made "void of offense toward God and men" is a heart purified. But this can only be accomplished through the forgiveness of sins, since "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God." It follows that the purification of the heart from sin is not the purging away of some moral pollution, in addition to the remission of sins, but it is really remission itself, made known to the relief of the conscience.

The great work achieved in behalf of humanity through the provisions of the atonement has now been considered as one, whether called pardon, justification, sanctification, or redemption. It is not pretended that these terms are equivalent in their individual signification, any more than that the two phrases "church of God" and "kingdom of heaven," though denoting the same thing, are equivalent in meaning. Pardon, justification, etc., though really identical, are relatively distinguishable. They denote the same great work, but present that work in different relations. Thus when man is said to be pardoned, we are looking at the sins from which he has been saved. When he is said to be justified, we are looking at the righteousness he has obtained through Christ, as "the end of the law for righteousness to every believer." The act, however, is the same, for, as we said in the beginning, the "imputation of righteousness" is the "non-imputation of sin." Man is not first pardoned, then justified, and then sanctified; much less is he justified through one agency, and sanctified through an agency altogether different; but realizes at one time and in one grand work of the atonement the Savior as his "wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption."

That a man is justified and sanctified when he receives the remis-

sion of his sins is also evident from the fact that these are all suspended upon the same conditions, namely, faith and obedience—the obedience of the gospel. We will conclude this essay with the scriptural proof of the fact here stated. With some, indeed, the purification of the heart is anterior to all obedience, even faith itself included. With these again, and many more, “faith alone” is the one condition on which the sinner is justified or pardoned. These disagree with the apostle James, who asserts that “by works a man is justified, and not by faith only,” giving, among other examples, Rahab the harlot (a sinner), as a case illustrative of the fact asserted. Faith and obedience, then, according to James, are the conditions of pardon, of justification. On the other hand, those who teach that the heart of the sinner is purified prior to obedience are at issue with the apostle Peter. “Seeing,” says he, “that you have purified your souls in obeying the truth, through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that you love one another with a pure heart fervently.” The terms “heart” and “soul” are here used synonymously, for the exhortation to love “with a pure heart” is based upon the fact that these brethren had obtained a pure heart, *i. e.*, had “purified their souls in obeying the truth.” Now how could Peter say this if their hearts had been purified before they obeyed? Just here we observe that the purification of the heart is very often confounded with what is ordinarily called “a change of heart,” which consists in a change from the love of sin to the love of holiness. Such a change is, of course, prior to obedience, but it does not constitute that purging or purification of the heart from an evil conscience of which the Scriptures speak. It is in the confounding of these two distinct changes that the error just exposed has had its birth.

We have now shown, we think, conclusively, that pardon, justification, and sanctification, as a purification of the heart, are one work ; that this work is due to the efficacy of the atonement ; and that, as a blessing, it is bestowed on the conditions of faith and the obedience of the gospel.

G.

A more difficult subject than the atonement is not presented in holy writ ; nor do I know of another so much in need of an elaborate and exhaustive investigation. It needs a profound handling. Our thoughtful and scholarly Bro. G. does little more than inaugurate the subject. I should now like to present about four more able consecutive articles on it. Who will speak next? This is no theme for the novice. Ripe heads and clear thought are in requisition now. G. is especially invited to speak again, and still more fully.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

THE word tempt occurs in the Bible in two very different acceptations, accordingly as God or Satan happens to be the author of the act expressed by it. Popularly, the word denotes an effort to induce a person to do wrong ; and when Satan is the author of the act it expresses, this is universally its meaning. Not so, however, when it relates to God. When he is the author of the act it denotes simply a trial, but a trial the object of which is always good. Thus we read in Genesis : " And it came to pass after these things that God did tempt Abraham." Now in the popular sense of the term God did not tempt Abraham, that is, lay before him an incentive to induce him to sin. This, of course, God is incapable of. What he did was simply to subject Abraham to a great trial, with the view of testing whether his regard for the divine authority rose above the love he bore for his cherished Isaac. The object of the trial was eminently good. It was to test the regard which a great and true man bore for the word of his Creator, and by the test still further to educate or strengthen that regard. Again : we are told that " God tempts no man." This is strictly true ; but here the word is taken in its usual sense. God lays before no one an inducement to wrong. Such is the use, and, I may add, the history of the word. Consequently, whenever we meet with the word, in order to determine the sense in which we must take it, we have simply to settle whether God or Satan is author to the act. When applied to men, it is usually to be taken in its bad and not in its good sense. We, alas, tempt our fellows to sin, but seldom lead them through trials for the purpose of developing and giving endurance to manly virtue and other noble human traits. How sad the thought that we should generally be found working on the side of the great enemy !

In the case in hand the word tempt is clearly to be taken in its bad sense. The object of Satan indisputably was to induce Christ to do wrong, and thereby to ruin him, and, through him, the human family. Certainly that august foe meditated no good in his act. Malice colored his intent, and ruin was the end to which he looked.

Matthew's account reads thus : " Then was Jesus led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the Devil." And herein we have a lesson on which we must bestow a thought before we pass on. Christ *was led out* to be tempted. He, then, did not go out of his own accord. He sought not the temptation ; he was led to it. The will of another, not his own, controlled him here. Not that he went absolutely against his will ; this would have been impossible. It

was another's will that he should be tried ; he merely allowed himself to be led to it. To Christians should not this be an example ? They should never seek temptation. To court it may be fatal. Far safer is the Christian when between him and the object which tempts him there lies an impassable ditch and stands an impassable wall. When Satan has a temptation in a Christian's eye, he has a hook in his heart. With this he may effect his ruin. Let the Christian, then, shun temptation ; let him dread to encounter it ; let him look for it with wary eye ; and when he falls into it, let him reason within himself thus : The Father hath suffered this, and now I will acquit myself like a man. Bravely I will bear myself through the trial. Then will God help him. But let no Christian, in the vanity of his heart, think that he can with impunity wrestle with temptation. When with presumption he goes out of his way to find it, he is but whetting the spear to pierce his own soul with grief. Christians are not always philosophers. Sometimes they propose to quit evil habits. This is good. But to show how valiant they are, they will place the tempting object full in sight, and then say : Now see with what success I withstand. Frail brother, is this your case ? Beware ! When I am to be tempted, God in mercy place the temptation on the other side of the globe, but keep me here. Hardly then am I willing to take the risk.

We all remember the prayer the Savior taught his disciples, familiarly called the Lord's prayer. This prayer is wisely brief and comprehensively full. The great wants of humanity it embodies. It is marred by no redundancies. Amidst that group of vast petitions is this one : "Lead us not into temptation." There must, then, be something dreadful in temptation ; otherwise it would not here have been brought in, and the duty created, whenever we pray, to lay it before the Father, and ask him to shield us against it. Let no Christian, then, run the hazard of challenging it. Without temptation he is hardly safe ; with it, never. I have not much faith in his success who purposes reformation, but runs the daily round with the tempting bait in his pocket, or, it may be, sitting full in view. He may succeed ; but numerous as are the minutes of the day, so many are the chances against him.

Of Christ, Matthew continues : "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward hungry." These forty days and forty nights are simply read ; we never stop to meditate on them. We flippantly pronounce the words, but pause not to count the periods they express. Forty days and forty nights are a long time to fast. Do we realize it ? I fear not. For me I confess the task is not easy. What it is to fast a day I know ; what it is to fast even seven I painfully remember, for this I once did ; but what it is to fast forty days and forty nights, this surpasses me. I can not attain

to it. I believe the fact, profoundly believe it, believe it literally occurred ; but then to grasp it, exhaust it, realize it, here it is I feel my thought too short. I count forty days ; I then count forty nights ; count them slowly, measuredly, and still feel that I fall far short of the terrible reality. How hard it is to stretch the thought through forty hungry days and forty hungry nights ! Even thought itself starves and grows thin and lean from thinking of it.

The following may help to render our conception somewhat adequate to the reality. I had it from the lips of the man himself. It is no fiction. The fall had fully come, that season when bucks look proud and sport their antlers high, when does grow sleek and plump ; the season when ancient hunters mold their bullets, wipe their guns, grow restive, and talk of the woods and deer. None can resist the infection ; indeed, call not him a man who can. The life of the tent, I like it. Give me my jolly troop of hearty fellows, my pony, my rifle, and my hounds, and I am in the woods again. The soul grows lithe and sweet with the life, the face bright and glad, the heart free, genial, and kind, and the thought fluent and bounding. It is a glorious unbending of weary nature. I repeat, this season had fully come. One of our sturdy western pioneers prepared for his accustomed hunt. He took with him only his little boy, a single horse, his faithful dog, and hunting-piece. He set out and traveled two days northward from his humble home. Here he came on woods where from signs he conjectured deer were plenty. He pitched his tent for the night, and anxiously awaited the morrow. The morning at length came, and he prepared for his first sally. Fatal morning, that ! As he drew his piece from the tent it went off. The whole great load passed through his thigh, shattering and tearing it in a most shocking manner. The poor man screamed, and felt that his end had come ; yet he stanchd the blood as best he could, and lived on. The day wore away, and with it wore the man. He felt that he could not live. At length he called to him his little boy, and said : "My son, I can not live. You know that we have brought no provisions with us. I trusted to my gun to supply our wants. This hope is gone from us now. I know not that we are within twenty miles of a human dwelling. If you stay with me the end will be that we shall die together. It is best that you should try to return to your mother. When I am dead you can help to raise your little brothers and sisters. Take the horse and guide him toward home as well as you can guess some two or three miles from the tent. Then drop the bridle on his mane and let him go. His instinct may carry him home. But if you attempt to guide him you will get lost and perish in the woods."

With this advice father and child parted, with what feelings the reader is left to imagine. Still on, from day to day, the wounded

man lived. The presumption is, that the little boy feared to take his father's advice and give the horse his way. He soon became bewildered, and wandered in the woods some five or six days with not one bite to eat. At length he happened on a log cabin, in which lived an honest hunter. The boy told his piteous tale. That hunter's heart was deeply touched. Soon the whole thinly settled land was alive with the saddening news. Every hunter was on his horse with horn and hound, ready for the search. They retracked the boy with their dogs as far as they could. Then they followed his trail through peavine and prairie grass till all trace of his route disappeared. The question still remained : Where is the wounded hunter ? The little boy was utterly confused, and could give not the faintest idea of the whereabouts of his father. He could only tell that he had gone north from home into the Grand River region. Those men parted wide, covering the land for miles, and all abreast started northward. The whole country rang with the long-drawn notes of horns, and the loud *hoowee* of the hunter. That is a very peculiar sound ; if the reader has never heard it, he has little conception of how far it can be heard. Day after day saw the ineffectual search brought to a close only to be renewed with greater energy the next.

Meantime the wounded man lay in his tent, daily wasting from loss of blood, and each hour growing feebler and more excited. His faithful dog stuck by him closer than his life seemed likely to do. His hunger and thirst became overpowering. On the thirteenth day he looked at his hands, pinched up the muscles on his fingers, and asked himself if he could not bite these off and eat them, and thus keep life in a little longer. He thought of cutting off his wounded limb and trying to live on that. How horrid ! Yet he had fasted but thirteen days ; the Savior fasted forty. The dog was next thought of, and the purpose formed to kill him, and try to live on him. That brave hunter could not support the thought. Through thirteen days and nights his dog had starved with him, and yet showed no sign of desertion. Besides, each day that faithful companion in suffering would go up into the edge of a prairie a few rods off, and there sit and howl most piteously for whole hours at a time, as if, by instinct, he hoped to catch the ear of some passing hunter and bring him to the relief of his master. But the fourteenth day came, and with it the wounded man felt his mind begin to wander. He knew that without relief, all would soon be over now. His anguish was overwhelming. He called his dog up and wildly struck him dead with his butcher's knife. He looked on him as he struggled in death, dashed his knife from him, and said : " Faithful fellow, I will never touch your flesh ; we will lie in death together." The day wore on, and the wounded man grew weaker and wilder. Near sunset he held his breath, for he thought he heard the distant *hoowee* of a man. He listened, listened,

intensely listened. At length he caught the sound again. He could not be mistaken. The thought flashed on his mind it is the voice of neighbors, and they seek me. He struggled to answer; but his feeble voice reached not a rod. He looked at his lifeless dog. "Alas! faithful friend," he said, "were you alive now, how soon you would bound into the presence of that distant man, and yet I might be saved to wife and little pets." He screamed, and was wild as a maniac. He calmed a little, and again listened for that sound. Again he caught it, and again. It drew nearer, it did; but would it pass by? How overmastering must have been the solicitude of that moment! But it will relieve the mind of the reader to learn that soon that wounded man was being ministered to by kind-hearted friends, who restored him and bore him proudly home to the relief of a frantic wife and weeping children. Yet that man fasted only fourteen days; the Savior fasted forty. We shall never reach the height of this. We may meditate and think and mean to do justice, but we can not. We shall never know, while in the flesh, what it is to fast forty days and forty nights. Experience alone could give us this knowledge, and we should die far short of that experience.

But at the end of the forty days and forty nights Christ grew hungry. Previously, then, he had not been so. How he had not, or why, we shall never know; and speculation is of no avail. But by skeptics the fact has been used against Christ. Who, they ask, could not fast forty days and forty nights, if he felt not the pain? Now, without attempting to reply, I shall venture the assertion that the fact of not feeling hungry till the end of the forty days stood against the Savior's success, and not in its favor. When I fast one day, this prepares me to fast another; when I fast two, I am disciplined for the third, and so on. But the Savior fasted forty days without getting hungry. Now it would be idle to say that this long fast had no effect on him. That it was wasting him, enfeebling him, and thus preparing him for the crisis, needs no proof. If not, why did Satan await the end of the forty days? Why did he not attack the Savior the first day? He knew well those forty days were telling on that glorious form. He waited till they had spent their force; and this he knew to be his time. From some mysterious cause the pain of hunger had been kept in abeyance till the forty days expired. But then, like the famished lion from his jungle, it rushed on the Savior with all the greater force, because it had not been felt. We are amazed that he so stood the shock. The wonder is, that even his unequalled strength was not bowed beneath the weight. This, then, is not in the Savior's favor.

And now Satan approaches him. Over this meeting hovers an awful sublimity. We shudder to meditate on it. The Son of God is alone; watched, but not helped by angels. He is hungry and weak.

Man's great foe, proud in his vast strength, steps from his lurking place, and like a robber in your path confronts him. For a moment let us pause and count his chances of success. For four thousand years of the world's history, his work had been to tempt men. In not one solitary case in this long period had he failed. In every instance success had crowned his skill. And now that masterly skill is to exhaust itself on Christ. Abraham, Job, and Daniel had bowed down the back low in ignominy to it. Adam and Noah had not been proof against it. All whom God had loved and honored had been disgraced by it. Even angels had been seduced by it from their first estate, and lay low in sin under it. If not by man irresistible, at least it had never been wholly resisted. And now Christ, at the end of a fast which had taken the strength out of the very shreds which knit his heart together, stands matched against that foe and that skill. Even now, though we know the upshot, we dread to trust him in the encounter. We feel that even the Son of God is not free from danger here. But frail worms of the dust are we, this is but a feeling.

But Satan approaches Christ, approaches him as a friend, as is his everlasting wont ; nay, more, approaches him, if not as his superior, at least as his peer ; approaches him without introduction, without apology ; approaches him in the very nick of time with honeyed suggestions distilling from his lips. *If you are the Son of God command that these stones become bread.* Could anything be more considerate, anything be more kind ? Christ has fasted forty days ; his hunger is intolerable. What most does he want ? Bread, bread, bread ; all nature clamors bread.

But let us change our mood a little. Where lay the temptation ? In what item of all the series did it consist ? What constitutes it ? Suppose Christ had commanded the stones to become bread, would that have been sin ? I can not see it ; yet it is almost universally so assumed. But had he any inclination in and of himself, any previous inclination, to convert the stones into bread ? If not, how could Satan's suggestion constitute a temptation. Surely what he was in no sense inclined to could be no temptation to him. Or had he in himself the previous inclination ? If so, how then shall we acquit him of the charge of being of himself, and without Satan, inclined to wrong ? On the supposition that to have converted the stones into bread would have been wrong, I do not see how we can. Nor do I feel that a necessity exists to attempt it. Christ was clothed in humanity. Whatever that humanity would be of itself inclined to do in us, in a given case, it would, in the same case, be inclined to do in him. That we should have been inclined, in his case, had we possessed the power, to convert the stones into bread, I think nothing short of certain. Why, then, should he not have been so inclined ?

In that case, the glory of his triumph would have consisted in this—that though inclined to provide himself with bread under circumstances which created the most overwhelming want of it that ever existed, yet he held that inclination in check and gratified it not. From this the practical moral would be, that since overpowering human inclination was held in check in that case, it can be in every case.

But we are not quite done with the question, Would it have been wrong to convert the stones into bread? The general, indeed I might say the universal assumption is that it would. But on what ground this assumption rests is not clear. Even allowing that it would have been a contravention of some law of nature, do we not know that Christ was himself these laws, and hence rose above them? This view, therefore, can hardly be held as tenable. Nor is it more satisfactory to say that Christ was restrained from the miracle by the consideration that he himself would have been the party benefited by it. This always sounded to me like trifling with common sense. That he might work a miracle to feed a hungry multitude, and yet none to feed himself when hungry, is to me not consistent. True, it may be said that such were the conditions of the temptation that he was not to use his power to defeat it, and the position, perhaps, would have to be conceded. But this would imply that to have converted the stones into bread would have been right and not wrong, and that Christ was restrained therefrom merely by stipulation or courtesy. Thus the question would be settled. To my mind, had Christ commanded the stones to become bread, his act would have been as innocent as the sigh of the wind. Certainly it might not have been, but we can never say confidently it would not.

Nor is it at all necessary to conclude that the act would have been wrong. What Satan wanted was to ruin Christ, and through him the human family; or if not to ruin him, at least to obtain from him some act by means of which he could defeat his purpose to save man. This he could as effectually do by a right act as by a wrong one, provided he could always make the right act appear wrong. Let us now, waiving the assumption of wrong, see what use Satan could have made of the act had Christ performed it.

In order to do this we must weigh well the issue which Satan himself makes, and the language he uses. *If you are the Son of God.* This is clearly the language of doubt, and not of an alternative. I know that efforts have been made to make the contrary appear, but evidently without success. But the question arises, whose doubt does the language imply? Does it imply Satan's? Hardly. He must have known Christ to be the Son of God. The demons under him knew this; and it is not likely that their chief was less wise than they. Does it imply Christ's doubt? Of course not. Whose doubt,

then, does it imply? Or is it really necessary to assume that it implies the doubt of any particular person or being? I hardly think so. The object of Satan appears to have been to get Christ to act *as if* doubting that he was the Son of God, or as implying it. Had Christ accepted the issue made by Satan, thereby he would have put the question in controversy, and to that extent have seemed to admit it to be doubtful. And from Christ's seeming to admit the doubt, Satan would have made the world believe that he did admit it. This would have been fatal. The argument would then have stood thus: If he were the Son of God he could not doubt it; his act admits a doubt; hence he is not the Son of God. Had Hume possessed an argument like this, resting on an undoubted premise, it is difficult to imagine how the world could have parried the force of his logic.

Whether Satan would thus have used his act, had Christ commanded the stones to become bread, of course we can not confidently say. The view is inferential. That he would have made some fatal use of it there is not a doubt; but what use we can not tell. Our ignorance here is surely bliss. Of one thing, however, we feel sure, that no act could have been more disastrous on the part of the Savior than one implying that he doubted his being the Son of God; and had he performed the one suggested by Satan, I do not see how it could have been held to be free from that implication.

But it will be replied, would not the miracle itself have destroyed the doubt? Not at all. The miracle could have proved, not the rank of Christ, but simply that he was sent from God, whereas the very point which his act would have put in doubt was his rank. Paul wrought miracles, but they had no power to prove him to be the Son of God. As a proof they fell far short of this. Christ's miracles certainly proved him to be sent of the Father, but it took the voice of the Father with his own to determine his rank. Hence the doubt would still have remained, notwithstanding the miracle.

But had Christ commanded the stones to become bread, there is still another use which Satan could have made of his act hardly less fatal than the one just pointed out. He could then boldly have said to the Christian: "My suggestions are not always wrong; they are sometimes right; it is hence not at all times wise to reject them. Did not your own Master on one occasion accept one and act on it? You would do well in the present case to follow his example." Then the difficulty would have risen,—which are the right suggestions, and which are the wrong? This, again, would have left the Christian in doubt and bewildered; and whenever Satan has a doubt in a man's mind he has the man on his hip. Then it is that ruin draws nigh and threatens. From one thing I pray to be delivered not less ardently than I do from temptation—that thing is doubt. Such is the infirmity of human nature that the chances seem always much in favor of our

falling, not on the safe, but on the dangerous side of doubt. Deep, then, should be our solicitude to be delivered from it.

Again : allowing that Christ's act, had he turned the stones into bread, would have been both perfectly innocent and perfectly free from the implication of doubt, still the case admits of another view. We are to do nothing at Satan's suggestion. Though the act were faultlessly innocent, nay, weightily obligatory, still, if Satan suggest it, I am to decline. Or if I do not wholly decline, and leave the act undone, at least must I utterly decline to do it *as* in obedience to Satan's suggestion. In no case must I allow him to determine my conduct. Both the law and the suggestions to which I owe obedience must come alone from Christ. Satan has forfeited his right even to make suggestions to me. He is never entitled to the presumption of charity. Always is he to be held as designing evil. Hence were he even to command me to worship God, I am to decline the act, not wholly, but wholly as determined by him.

Before passing to the second temptation according to Matthew, I must digress long enough to state more fully and distinctly than has yet been done the sense in which I am taking these narratives, and in which I hold they must be taken. I am taking them, then, literally, not figuratively. I in no sense admit the temptation of Christ to have been merely mental. With me, it was either literal, just as it is recorded, or it never occurred. There is no middle ground. I hold to a literal journey of Christ, not in thought, but in his proper person, into a literal wilderness ; I hold to a literal Devil, and a literal meeting of that literal Devil with the literal Christ ; I hold to a literal interview, in which the Devil literally saw the Savior and the Savior literally saw the Devil—a literal interview in which they' literally talked the one to the other—literally talked in audible words, which we have literally set down in the accounts we have of the case. I convert nothing here into metaphor or drapery. With me all is literally true or none is. I believe there were literal stones lying literally in the presence of Christ and Satan when the latter said : " Command these stones to become bread ; that Satan literally wanted Christ to convert the stones into literal bread, and then literally eat it. I have no confidence in those methods of interpretation which convert these and other like inscrutable facts of the sacred record into convenient figures of speech ; neither have I any respect for the infidelity, not faith, which adopts these methods. When the Bible talks of things which lie beyond the limit of sensible human knowledge, it is dangerous to convert those things into the mere creatures of the human fancy. They may not be literal, certainly ; but if not, sure I am that we know not what they are. Hence it is hazardous to say figurative.

The second temptation does not seem so easily comprehended as the first ; or, more correctly, we do not so readily recognize in it

those traits which constitute a temptation. Christ is taken by the Devil from the wilderness into Jerusalem. There he is placed on a wing or high point of the temple. He is then addressed as at first : *If you are the Son of God, cast yourself down.* Here we have repeated the same treacherous language of the former case. We may rest assured there is something very significant in it. It is not the language of impulse, nor merely suggested by the moment. It is studied, preconceived, and with masterly skill adapted to an end. What that end was we may never know while in the flesh. We should have known, and bitter would have been the knowledge, had Satan succeeded. Here, at least, we are happy to know no more.

But in what, in the present case, consisted the temptation? I repeat it is not easy to see. Christ stands upon a giddy height of the temple. Could he really have had any inclination to leap from this height? It seems impossible to so conclude. Human nature recoils from the thought; and Christ possessed no other nature which could have been so inclined. And if in no sense nor for any reason inclined to the leap, certainly it is difficult to see how the suggestion of Satan could have created the inclination. Could Christ really have felt tempted to take the leap? Perhaps we are compelled to so hold, though utterly unable to understand how or see why. Had Satan denied that the Father would keep his promise respecting the Son, in that case the Son might have felt provoked to take the leap to show that the Father would keep his word, but Satan drops not even an implied hint to that effect. The case seems perplexed; and it may be so intentionally. By it the heavenly Father may intend to teach us that it is of the very nature of Satan's temptations that they bewilder and beget uncertainty. When once the mind is confused, wrong action becomes easy. Never is man so unsafe as when clouded as to his duty. When this is the case, such is the frailty of human nature, such the strength of temptation, and such the subtlety of Satan in directing it, that sin is almost sure to be the result. A mind self-possessed, and clear in its perception of duty, are conditions absolutely essential to right action.

But Christ must have been from some cause inclined to take that leap; otherwise it was no temptation, and to resist it no trial. Why so inclined we may never see. Clearly, the leap suggested by Satan was the precise act which he wanted Christ to perform. But suppose Christ had taken the leap, would the act have been wrong? In the case it would; apart from what it would have implied, it would not. But, in the first place, the act in itself and by itself would have been extremely foolish. To us clearly a like act in our time would be set down as conclusive of lunacy. It is difficult to see what could have suggested it to Satan. Either, surely, he must have hoped to induce Christ to be guilty of extreme folly, or the heavenly Father was so

overruling him as to make him appear guilty of it. For of all the acts I can imagine, not one comes so near up to the very height of folly as this. This of itself, no matter how strongly inclined from other considerations to take it, must have been enough to restrain the Savior from it. But Satan's object was not simply to get Christ to take the leap that he might be enabled to impeach him with folly. This he may have designed to do ; but he had a far deeper design than this. Suppose Christ had taken the leap, waiving anything further as to the nature of the act itself, what would it have implied ? Clearly it would have implied doubt as to the veracity of the Father. This would have rendered it infinitely fatal, and this is what Satan designed. Of Christ it was written : " God will charge his angels respecting you, and on their hands they shall carry you, lest you strike your foot against a stone." This Christ knew to be written of himself ; but the issue Satan's proposition made was : Will God keep his word ? Leap and see. Now Christ could have had no motive in taking the leap but to put this question to the test. But why test the question ? If in no sense doubtful, there was no need to test it ; it could have been necessary to test it only on the supposition that it was doubtful. This doubt, therefore, Christ's act would have implied. The argument against him then would have stood thus : If he were the Son of God he could not doubt the word of his Father ; his act indisputably implied that he did doubt it ; hence he was not the Son of God. To this argument human ingenuity could never have discovered a reply. It would utterly have wrecked the purposes of the Savior.

In the first temptation the object of Satan seems to have been to get Christ so to act as to imply that he himself doubted his being the Son of God, or to get him to act *as if* he doubted it ; in the second, his object clearly was to get him to perform an act which should imply that he doubted the Father's word. In either case the act would have been ruinous.

Here seems the proper place to notice the replies of the Savior. To Satan's first proposition the reply was : " It is written man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word going out through the mouth of God." On this the argument would obviously be : Christ had other food than bread on which to live ; there was therefore no absolute necessity to convert the stones into bread ; and without such necessity it would have been wrong. This would leave the act of conversion, not as heretofore insisted, absolutely innocent, but only contingently so. It would leave it innocent, if necessary ; but the reverse, if not. The reader is left to judge for himself.

The second reply was : " You shall not put the Lord your God to the test." On this not a doubt can arise. When God speaks, we are to take for granted that he speaks the truth ; when he promises, we

must hold that he will keep his word. If we perform an act to see whether he will keep it, this implies that we distrust him, and hence wish to test him. This we must not do. If God's promises are unconditional, certainly he will keep them whether we test him or not; but generally they are contingent. He will keep them provided we believe him, otherwise he is absolved.

We come next to consider the third temptation, which, though more grand, is less complex than the other two. From them it certainly differs widely; and though less intricate than they, it can hardly be felt to be less dangerous. With us it would have proved more disastrous than both the others. It would have been an appeal to our lust of power which would have been overwhelming. We should never have withstood it.

Christ is taken by Satan up to the top of a high mountain; and all the kingdoms of the world, with their glory, are shown him in a moment. The thing is impossible, cries the skeptic, wholly impossible. With the skeptic I know the thing is impossible; with me it is the very reverse. Had the Savior and Satan been mere men, the skeptic's objection would be unanswerable. Man has no power to show man what Satan showed Christ. But they were not mere men. The one is a being of infinite power; the other a being with power just finite. Even if Satan possessed not the power in himself, and we can hardly doubt that he did, still for the present awful purpose it would have been an easy matter to invest him with it. To wake in Christ, at a single sight, the whole lust of power which dwells in humanity was a masterly feat. No common view of earth could do this. It must all be seen. The whole of political power is measured only by all the kingdoms of the world. The whole of this power alone can excite the whole volume of human lust of power. This volume it was necessary to excite in Christ. No sight but the one he saw could do it. The end proposed and the means used agree. When the sight had wrought the passion to its utmost height, Satan added: "All these things I will give you if you will fall down and worship me." For a moment let us pause and reflect upon the great monarchs and politicians of earth whom Satan has successfully drugged with the smallest conceivable fraction of this vast power. Few, indeed, have they been who have successfully resisted it. Not one of them could have withstood it all. This vast power is all tendered to Christ upon a single condition, with which he could have complied in less time than it takes me to write this sentence. Proudly may we affirm that he was the Son of God, and not a mere man, or that he would have bowed the knee. Not an event of his life shows him rising higher above humanity than this. It is the sublimest victory of the three. Would that all Christian men would determine to do what Christ did—decline to hold political power at the cost of sin; and seldom is it held at a less cost.

But we are told that Satan lied in the case, that the power he claimed was not his, and that hence he could not have made his promise good. Perhaps so ; but my faith is that he would have kept that promise to the letter. On this I have not a doubt. Why did not the Savior say to him : The power is not yours to give ? This would have been overwhelming. He knew the Devil spoke the truth ; therefore he does not contradict. The great moral issue is the one to which he replies : "You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve." The victory is complete, and glorious as complete.

Here we close our reflections on this sublime and fearful episode in the Savior's life. I wish my pen had left nothing but light behind it. The best has been done that could be.

PATTERSON INSTITUTE, AT NORTH MIDDLETOWN, KY.—In the brief notice I am going to write of this modest but sterling school, I am not to be understood as intending to pronounce it the very best the land can boast, nor yet as wishing to disparage other similar institutions. I wish to do this justice, but at the same time others no injustice.

Bro. Patterson is too diffident to push his school out into notice as it deserves to be. He is a man of high worth, with not one humbugging element in him. He can not brag, and will not even talk of the merits of his school as in truth he might. I hence crave to speak a word for him.

His school is exclusively for females ; and his teaching, though not pretentious, is elementary and thorough. I am much mistaken if it is excelled in the land. His table is one of the very best I ever saw in any school. His discipline is strict, but considerate and kind ; his intercourse with his girls dignified, chaste, and pure ; and I confess I know not where the moral training of his school is surpassed. He is himself a Christian and a gentleman ; his wife a Christian and a lady ; and beyond my own roof I know not the home in which I would prefer my daughter to be trained.

Patterson Institute stands in one of the finest neighborhoods in the State of Kentucky ; and nowhere do I know a truer church than Bro. Patterson's girls meet with every Lord's day. The place is notoriously healthy, and wholly free from the influence of corrupting amusements and hardly less corrupting fashions. Here girls in plain bonnets and plain dresses can quietly pursue their studies to the pride of teacher and joy of parent, with no distractions to waste time or dissipate thought. The school is designed to furnish a thorough education—thorough in science, thorough in literature, thorough in music. I have nowhere heard finer singing than the girls are here taught to do. To all, then, I say, give Bro. J. T. Patterson the patronage his school so justly merits.

FAIRS AND THEIR EFFECTS.

Few persons, without a somewhat extended experience in the item, can form any just conception of the difficulty of raising the funds necessary to meet the demands of the churches. It is humiliating, extremely so, to know that the difficulty exists; yet that it does exist is indisputable. That men who have been redeemed by Christ, and made to rejoice in the hope of immortality and eternal life; who have been prospered by him in the wealth of this world—that these men should evince the utter want of liberality which we know they do evince, as a general rule, is one of the mysteries of sin and of satanic influence which we shall never be able to solve while in the flesh. That these men are naturally worse than those less favored, no one can for a moment think. How is it, then, that they bear not themselves more nobly and more generously in things affecting the cause of the Master? Had I an answer to this question which I could use to the reformation of the brethren of whom I am speaking, and without wounding their feelings, with deep pleasure would I give it. I can not scowl their evil out of them; I wish I could. For the inconceivable good which would result, I could certainly consent to the unlovely end of becoming even a scowler. But this would not effect the object. Could I argue them into a better life, I would spin my logic over them till it should become as thin, to use the expression of some one, as the web of a famished spider. I would crack modes and syllogisms over their heads till not one in Hamilton had been left untried. But this has been often done by other hands, and as often has it failed. What recourse, then, is left to us? I confess myself perplexed for an answer.

Of all the evils, to use no harsher a term, which afflict frail humanity, I set the evil of covetousness down as the chief. It is now, if it has not always been, the great masterly curse of the church. All the works written by infidels, together with all the speeches they have ever made against the cause of Christ, have been as nothing in comparison with the injury it has sustained from the single item of covetousness. Nor do I see even the slightest prospect of curing it. This grieves me more, if possible, than the evil itself. Could we remedy it, bravely should we bear its burdens till the cure should be completed. But we are in despair. Every other sin of the human heart admits of a remedy, while all diseases of the human body may be treated with more or less success, but for covetousness there is no remedy. When once it has set up its throne in the human heart it is never dislodged. I doubt whether there now lives a man who can

call to mind an instance in which a covetous man has ceased to be covetous, and become generous in his impulses and liberal in giving. If any brother in our ranks knows of such a case, and will write it out in proper style, I promise to honor his piece by laying it before the readers of the *Quarterly*. But though I thus promise, I never expect to be called upon to redeem the pledge. The idolater you may wean from his idol ; the ignorant you may enlighten ; the savage you may soften and restrain from the spilling of blood ; the vicious you may reform ; even the drunkard you may temporarily sober, and the rake dissuade from the "illicit rove ;" but the covetous man—keep him from being covetous? Never. Gout and consumption may be cured ; even leprosy itself is not hopeless ; small-pox and cholera are not always fatal ; dropsy and scrofula will yield under the right treatment ; but where, in all the space which lies under heaven, can a cure for covetousness be found? After the lapse of six thousand years, back comes the echo, where? Here, then, we have the great retarding blight of the church.

To remedy the evil but two modes seem to me to be left ; and in these I have no faith, or next thing to none ; hence I really feel, as already said, that practically we have no remedy. The first mode to which I allude is to exclude the covetous from the church. This would be attended with much difficulty. In the first place, it is by no means an easy thing to make out a clear case of covetousness to the entire satisfaction of a whole church. This I have seen actually tried, and hence speak from experience. So prevalent is the sin, and so general its effects, that but few members of the body are free from their influence. These effects are blindness and insensibility to the evil. When all, or nearly all, are thus blinded, it is hard to bring them to see the cause of the blindness. I have no hesitation in saying that, taking the whole mass of the Disciples in this country, there is not one in fifty who is not more or less under the influence of the sin. This they may not be consciously. I am far from thinking they are ; yet such in fact is the case. The very mode in which we are trained up is fatal. From the cradle the great lessons we daily learn is to get and keep. This we are taught, if not by words, yet by example. Certainly, in these circumstances it would be difficult to make us recognize that as sin in others which we are not willing to acknowledge as such in ourselves. I hence repeat there is great difficulty in bringing a church to see covetousness in its members. Where all are involved, who shall cast stones? That the covetous should be put away admits of no doubt, but who shall do it? Shall the covetous put the covetous away? Of one thing we may rest assured, they will not do it.

Again : so deeply seated is the evil in the church, that were we at once to attempt the remedy here suggested, we might, and most likely

would, involve the church in utter ruin. This we are not at liberty to do. We may not have labored sufficiently to prevent the evil ; hence, perhaps, we should bear longer before we attempt its complete cure. But the attention of the whole church should be at once called to it, and steps taken to reach the case as soon as it can be safely done.

The second mode to which I allude is to introduce the subject into our discourses, even to sinners before they enter the church. Here, in the very outset, impress on their minds that when they become obedient to Christ they will be expected to consecrate to him, not merely the service of their hearts, but their wealth. Let them know that unless they can get their consent to do this, they are in no condition to take the solemn step. Teach them that if a man love aught of earth more than Christ he is not worthy of him. Let this be done in a noble, kindly spirit, and it would have its effect. True, hereby many would be deterred from entering the church ; but what is the value to the church of a member who comes in stipulating as he comes that he is not to be required to give as God prospers him ? Is not his act a solemn farce ; and do we not owe it to him to tell him so ? No man is fit for the kingdom of God who is not ready, if need so require, to part even from wife and children, to say nothing of paltry goods and chattels. So taught Christ ; so should we teach. True, this would be no cure for covetousness ; but it would keep the church, to some extent, from being infested by it ; and where an evil can not be cured, but can in any measure be prevented, duty requires the latter.

Now it is the sin of covetousness that keeps the church impoverished ; and it is this impoverishment that so fatally prevents her discharging her great and solemn duties to the world. The desire to remedy this on the part of her better members is a noble desire ; but this desire does not always exert itself in legitimate channels. Such is the case when it leads to fairs, bazaars, picnics, and the like. Of these there are two kinds—one simply for pleasure, the other both for this and also for raising money. Are they wrong, or are they right ? Or are they partly this and partly that ? It is not here proposed to enter into a lengthy reply to these questions. A few hints and suggestions are all that is intended.

In determining the character of our conduct in a given case, the question first to be settled is : What says the Book ? As to fairs, etc., then, be it known the Book says nothing. They are unknown to it ; hence, specifically at least, they are neither sanctioned by it nor condemned. If condemned at all, consequently, they are condemned in general terms, and not by name. But before we can say whether condemned or not, we must know more of the nature of fairs, etc., their objects and tendencies.

When originated by Christians their object is not intentional evil. This I think certain. As to the motives, then, from which they spring,

they must be held either as innocent or indifferent. But what is their object? Pleasure, certainly. This pleasure may be mixed or simple; still it is pleasure. Now, clearly, the pleasure sought is not the pleasure which springs from worshipping God; for the acts performed are not claimed to be acts of worship. Indisputably, then, it is pleasure of "this life." Is it allowable? Its effect decides the question. "And that which fell among thorns are they who, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and *pleasures of this life*, and bring no fruit to perfection." Pleasures of this life, then, choke the hearers of the word and render them unfruitful. They are hence injurious, and therefore wrong. Consequently, we may not seek them nor indulge in them. This conclusion is just, and with the child of God should be final.

But here I shall be asked if I mean to deny to Christians utterly the right to indulge in anything which belongs to the Savior's "pleasures of this life." Can I set free where he has bound, or give a license where he withholds? The question itself suggests the answer. That the pleasure sought in fairs, bazaars, and so on, is pleasure of this life, admits of no doubt. From me hence no Christian has the permit to indulge in it. If there be "pleasures of this life" which do not choke, of these the Savior says nothing. In them, for aught I can see, Christians might indulge. But are there any such? If so, I know them not. If others think they do, with them I am not arguing.

But can fairs and bazaars be wrong where the object of them is good; namely, to raise money to build and furnish meeting-houses and to feed the poor? Certainly, I would not be understood as speaking against these benevolent works. That they are right lies far beyond dispute. But are fairs right? This is the question. If they be not right in themselves, hardly can they be shown to be right by the object of them. The end can not be pleaded to justify the means. Are they, then, right in themselves? I deny it. Now let their advocates make good their defense. In the present day, and in the present and many other like cases, we have a curious mode of arguing. Some source of pleasure or profit unknown to the Bible is invented, and with great stress of voice we are called upon to prove it wrong. Perhaps I make the attempt and fail. What is the result? Because I can not show the invention to be wrong, it is at once inferred to be right. But this is not fair. The burden of proof is with the inventors. It is they who must show their inventions to be right, not I who must show them to be wrong. If they fail, then results the presumption that what they can not show to be right is wrong, and hence should be repudiated. This is the true method of arguing the case. I do not believe fairs and bazaars can be shown to be affirmatively right; and unless so, to say the least, they are matters of doubt. Until this doubt is removed Christians should not touch them. So at least think I.

I am more than ready to grant, even allowing them to be wrong, that they fall far below the wrong of covetousness. Gross wrongs they can hardly be pronounced. Still, though not gross, nor yet as bad as covetousness, they are not right. At least they are not known to be right for the Christian ; and till so known he is without the liberty to use them. He may not perform the doubtful act. In all his conduct certainty must be his guide.

But to fairs, etc., as a means of raising money, there is a special objection. They promote covetousness. In every church there are two classes of members—the willing and the unwilling givers. The former seldom demand fairs ; the latter often do. The unwilling giver is always more anxious to be thought very liberal than the willing. The willing knows what is right and does it. With this he is satisfied. He tells nothing, says nothing. Not so with the unwilling. He knows what is right, but has not the soul to do it ; yet he would have you think he does it. He perks his paltry deed in your face with his own lip ; tells you how much he “put in,” even where you are the object of it. Covetous men are seldom delicate. They want to be thought the great pillars of the church. This no one is likely to suspect them to be ; hence they are sure vulgarly to tell you their deeds, especially where there is giving in them. What these men want is not to give. This they never want. What their souls pray for is, that they may never be called on to give. Ask them not for money ; you and they are friends for life. Now that they may never be asked for money, they want all the demands of the church met in some other way ; for they are great church men, exceedingly Christian. Fairs and the like contribute to meet these demands. Hence they like fairs ; because fairs help them. Fairs keep them from being asked for money. This promotes their religion. Their god grows daily larger now ; and they grow daily more devout. They are never so pious as when the purse is glibbous ; never so gloomy as when it wanes.

Have nothing to do with fairs ; and make repeated and heavy demands on the covetous. Possibly one in a thousand may be cured, while many will be driven from the church. Happy day for the cause of Christ when not one is left.

But there is another suspicious circumstance attending fairs. Who generally get them up ? The more godly members of the church ; or the light, the giddy, the slack ? With rare exceptions, the latter are the uniform aiders and abettors of fairs. The lovers of fun, the jolly merry rout, these are the fair-mongers of the church. The members who pray, who study God's holy truth, who shun temptation, the meek, the poor in spirit, the pious in heart, these seldom take part in fairs. From fairs and those who countenance them, the church, in my candid judgment, has nothing to hope, but much to

fear. From this rank our apostates will go out ; and when the time comes to bring in organs and make creeds, here shall we find the hands to do the work. With fairs and picnics go the fiddlers and dancers ; and already these are working mischief in our midst. The signs of a falling away are not obscure. I mourn over these symptoms with sincere grief. If they were an end they would not trouble me much ; but, alas, they are a beginning. In this lies my fear.

But, to my mind, there is yet a more serious objection to fairs, bazaars, and picnics than has yet been mentioned. I allude to the spirit they beget. This spirit is dangerously antichristian, and is never resisted. We imbibe it from the occasion, and naturally ; for an occasion has its spirit, its own peculiar spirit, as distinctly marked as is the spirit of a man. Indeed this is what makes many a place dangerous which otherwise might be innocent. No one ever yet felt one religious emotion at a picnic. Prayer at such a place would be a horrid incongruity. The feeling of piety dies in the heart, and devotion is an utter stranger. The spirit is the spirit of a carnival ; it is the spirit of revelry, hilarity, and vulgar jesting. It is low, carnal, and intensely animal, and is kept within decent bounds by mere conventional restraints. The dance, the bottle, and the dirk are its cherished cronies. God and Christ are banished from its presence ; and hell and Satan are merry-making myths. Death is never in the thought ; and the grave and the judgment day lie countless leagues out of sight. The broad laugh, the mindless grin, and the loud silly chat, these proclaim the spirit which dominates at all such places. Surely Christians can never with safety suffer themselves to drink into this spirit. The soul dies in it ; and all holy aspirations are blighted by it and wilt as if bitten by a frost. A penitential tear was never yet shed in a fair, nor a sinner known in anguish to cry, What shall I do to be saved. They are Christless places, barren as Sahara of every feeling which leads to the hidden life in God. I pray my brethren to let them alone utterly. The parent who encourages his child to frequent them may bitterly rue it ; and the child who goes may rue it. In the great day when God judges the secrets of all hearts, my prayer for you, my brother, is, that you may stand acquitted in his everlasting kingdom. But you may there miss that son, that daughter. Suppose you should approach the Savior and say : Master, are my children here ? and he should reply : Not here, not here, my friend. What, then, of fairs, bazaars, and picnics ? Think before you speak again.

“The love of money is the root of all evil ; through the desire of which, some have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”—1 Tim. vi., 10.

THE EDITOR ON MIRACLES, SECUNDUM HINSDALE.

THE April number of the *Quarterly* contains an article from the pen of its editor on "Ecce Homo," in which an important question is quite fully discussed, viz., that of miracles. On some parts of this article I desire to make some strictures. Passing by the animadversions on "Ecce Homo," I shall come at once to the substantive part of the article.

It is, no doubt, difficult to define a miracle ; still I confess to some surprise on reading these statements : "if an adequate definition of one exists, it is unknown to me ;" and "loose popular definitions are abundant, but the least thought bestowed on them shows them to be defective." Take these statements in connection with those made in this paragraph : "Now on these miracles rests the whole superstructure of Christianity. It stands only with them, or with them goes down. They are its guaranty and proof. By them it arose, by them it is supported. If they never occurred, it is a fable. If they are not received, it must be rejected." If these passages should come to an unbeliever's eye, would they not start the suspicion that there is something wrong ? Would it not at least strike him as very remarkable that that on which "the whole superstructure of Christianity rests," by which only it "stands," with which it "goes down," by which it "arose and is still supported," its "guaranty and proof," should, in the whole history of the church, have had nothing better than "loose," "popular," "defective" definition ? I do not feel disposed to press this point. Probably it goes for very little in the argument, and attention is called to it simply because these statements are a little startling.

I come at once to the editor's definition. It is this : "A miracle is an instantaneous effect, produced by the exertion at will, on the part of its author of almighty power, and proving that what he says has the divine sanction."

What is said of the defects of the various definitions extant, naturally raises the reader's expectations very high. We certainly look for something very far from "loose," to say nothing of its being "popular" and "defective." How it may be with others I can not say, but I must confess to some disappointment. Almost every clause in this definition seems to me open to weighty objection.

I.—A miracle is called an "effect." The only objection I have to this is, that it excludes prophecy from the genus miracle. According to the old classification, miracles were divided into miracles of power and miracles of foreknowledge—the *miracula potentiae* and the

miracula præscientiæ of the old theologians. I see no good reason for disturbing this classification. Still, in what I shall write, that I may come to the issue at once, I shall use the term in the sense in which you have employed it.

II.—A miracle is an “instantaneous effect.” Now the question is not whether the miracles of the Bible were “instantaneous,” but whether instantaneousness is a necessary adjunct of the miraculous. Conceding that the Bible miracles were all “instantaneous,” we can not assume that we have in the Bible every manifestation of the divine power. Whether or not the miracles of the Bible are correctly described by this epithet does not matter. In defining a term only necessary ideas are included ; and the perfection of a definition consists in its including all that belongs to the term, and in excluding all that does not belong to it.

But on this point the editor seems to have had some misgivings after he wrote his definition. He says : “A miracle might be a long time in happening, yet this was never known to be the case. A dead man, for instance, might be a month in coming to life, and still the event be a miracle. Suddenness or instantaneousness was the universal accompaniment of the Christian miracles. It hence seems necessary to the idea.” I deny the force of the “hence ;” and leave it with those who can to show how “a miracle might be a long time in happening,” when “suddenness or instantaneousness” is “necessary to the idea.”

But it is not by any means clear that all the Bible miracles were “instantaneous.” I think it would trouble any man to prove it. The following passage, from a thoughtful, painstaking writer, is deserving of a careful reading : “The miracles of our Lord and those of the Old Testament afford many interesting points of comparison, and of a comparison equally instructive whether we trace the points of likeness or unlikeness which exist between them. Thus, to note first a remarkable difference, we find oftentimes the holy men of the old covenant bringing, if one may venture so to speak, hardly and with difficulty the wonder work to the birth ; there is sometimes a momentary pause, a seeming uncertainty about the issue ; while the miracles of Christ are always accomplished with the highest ease ; he speaks, and it is done. Thus Moses must plead and struggle with God. ‘Hear me now, O God, I beseech thee,’ ere the plague of leprosy is removed from his sister, and not even so can he instantly win the boon (Num. xii., 13–15) ; but Christ heals a leper by his touch (Matt. viii., 3), or ten with even less than this, merely by the power of his will and at a distance (Luke xvii., 14). Elijah must pray long, and his servant go up seven times, before tokens of the rain appear (1 Kings xviii., 42–44) ; he stretches himself thrice on the child, and cries unto the Lord, and painfully wins back its life (1 Kings xvii.) ;

and Elisha, with yet more of effort and only after partial failure (2 Kings iv., 31-35), restores the child of the Shunamite to life. Christ, on the other hand, shows himself the Lord of the living and the dead, raising the dead with as much ease as he performed the commonest transactions of life."

III.—But a miracle is "produced by the exertion" of "almighty power." The phrase "almighty power" seems to me very poorly chosen. Are we to understand that all the miracles manifest the same degree of power? Was the same power necessary to open the Red Sea and the river Jordan that was requisite to make the world? Both these questions must be answered in the negative. What, then, the propriety of ascribing all miracles indiscriminately to almighty power? Whether these points are all well taken or not, there seems to me no necessity of our using a stronger word here than supernatural. That is the term generally employed; I see no good reason why it should be abandoned.

But again: the comments on this part of the definition are singularly unfortunate. It is asked: "How shall we know the power to be almighty?" and answered thus: "By its being creative; almighty power alone can create."

Are we to infer from this that every miracle shows forth "creative power;" or only that it shows forth a power adequate to the work of creation? If the latter is meant, then I have nothing to say further than that the thought is very vaguely expressed, or rather not expressed at all. But I can not suppose this to be the meaning. "When power creates," the editor proceeds, "we at once infer that it is almighty, or that it is exerted by or derived from an almighty being. Certainly, the power which can instantly give an eye to him who never had one, or reproduce the flesh on a withered arm, or enlarge a loaf of bread so as to feed a thousand men, must be creative. * * * Indeed, these are themselves creative acts." This is all true enough; but it is claimed that the miracles were all "creative acts!" So far from this being true, many of them were directly the opposite. I see no way of avoiding this difficulty but to claim that even this destructive power was adequate to the work of creation. But this does not of necessity follow. Many are they who can destroy what they can not create; and how could the man who saw the act of destruction know that it was the act of a being capable of an act of creation? Besides, this is not contemplated in the definition.

IV—The last clause of the definition is this: "proving that what he says has the divine sanction." How this clause may impress others I can not undertake to say; but it gives me more trouble than all the other clauses put together. Am I to understand that the "effect" must possess a given character in order that it may be a miracle; or does this clause state the consequence of the preceding

clauses? Is conviction to follow, regardless of the character of the effect; or is the effect to have a given character in order to the producing of conviction? Or is it no miracle unless such conviction is wrought?

With the definition simply before me I can not determine these questions. I look, then, to the amplification. I read: "A miracle must prove that what he says who works it is divinely sanctioned. To do this the miracle must possess a specific character. It must not consist merely in the exertion of power in any way, or for any purpose. Its nature must be such as to show that it springs wholly from benevolence and kindness; and in all cases it must be beneficial to the subject of it. It must be wholly free from all appearance of evil; and must have no vicious tendency. On the contrary, it must be of a nature to impress the mind with sentiments of goodness and awe, and to inspire reverence and respect for God."

This is clear, and seems to be decisive of the intent of the clause above quoted. But in the next paragraph, in speaking of the miracles of Christ and the apostles, it is said: "They were effects, instantaneous effects, effects produced by creative power. They hence proved that their authors spoke by the divine sanction." What am I to make of this? It is here represented that conviction is the consequence or the result, and not to be considered in the definition at all. What is said above of a specific character is here lost sight of. Here the effect proves the divine sanction, because it is "instantaneous," "produced at will," "produced by creative power," and not at all because it has a "specific character."

Here is a painful confusion of thought and of language. If the kind of effect is to be considered, then the last clause should have read thus: "and of such a specific character as to prove that what he says has the divine sanction." Is it claimed that the words, as they now stand, convey that idea? Then what becomes of the second commentary? Is it claimed that they look to the conviction as a result? Then what becomes of the first commentary? In either case how can the two commentaries be reconciled?

It is very questionable, in my opinion, whether in defining a miracle we can be permitted to look at the ends or results at all. It would be difficult to reconcile a large number of scriptures with such a theory. The Bible certainly recognizes a class of miracles which were not intended to prove that those who wrought them spoke with the divine sanction. But more of this hereafter.

Passing beyond the term of the definition, the tenor of the article on "*Ecce Homo*" raises a very important question, viz., the relation in which miracle stands to doctrine. Archbishop Trench puts this question in this form: "Is the miracle to command, absolutely and without further question, the obedience of those in whose sight it

is done, or to whom it comes as an adequately attested fact, so that the doer and the doctrine, without any more debate, shall be accepted as from God?" This is certainly a question of greatest moment. Is the miracle, when defined, to be decisive of the doctrine; or have we the right to go beyond it to inquire into the character of the doctrine and to search for other evidences?

In answer to this question, it may, in the first place, be affirmed that there is in the Bible a line of diabolic wonders—miracles, if the reader please, running parallel with those that are from God. Satan has entered upon the arena of supernatural activity, and sought there to wrest the supremacy from the Almighty. Let us look at some of the traces, more or less distinct, of this conflict.

Trench, to whose excellent work I am indebted for several of the points made under this head, holds that there is a trace of this conflict in the contest which Moses had with the magicians of Egypt. I quote: "I can not doubt that, according to the intention of Scripture, we are meant to understand of the Egyptian magicians, that they stood in relation with a spiritual kingdom as truly as did Moses and Aaron. Indeed, only so does the conflict between those and these come out in its true significance. It loses the chiefest part of this significance, if we think of their wonders as mere conjurer's tricks, dexterous sleights of hand, with which they imposed upon Pharaoh and his servants; making believe, and no more, that their rods turned into serpents, that they also changed water into blood. Rather was this a conflict, not merely between the might of Egypt's king and the power of God, but the gods of Egypt, the spiritual powers of wickedness which underlay and were the soul of that dark and evil kingdom, were in conflict with the God of Israel. In this conflict, it is true, their nothingness very soon was apparent; but yet, most truly, the unseen kingdoms of light and darkness did then, in presence of Pharaoh, do open battle, each seeking to win the king for itself and to draw him into its own element. Else, unless it had been such a conflict as this, what meaning would such passages have as that in Moses' song: 'Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?' or that earlier: 'Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment; I am the Lord?'"

Whether this view of that memorable struggle be the correct one or not, one thing is certain: here was a power admirably calculated to impose on the people. If the wonders of the magicians were not displays of supernatural power, they were such excellent counterfeits that it was only after a protracted trial that their spuriousness was shown. Can we suppose that in such an emergency God would give his children over, bound hand and foot, to manifestations of supernatural power, with the understanding that they had no right to inquire into the character of the doctrine delivered, or to inquire for other evi-

dences? The theory against which I am arguing leaves the spectator in that fearful dilemma; but so soon as he has permission to try the doctrine, to search for other evidence, then the difficulty vanishes.

The author from whom I have quoted sees traces of the same conflict in the incarnation, in Satan's encounter with our Lord in the wilderness; and again in the "withstanding of Paul which is attributed to Elymas." He further relies very confidently upon these scriptures: "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." (Matt. xxiv., 24.) "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders." (2 Thess. ii., 9.) "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men." (Rev. xiii., 13.) They are "*lying* wonders" in Thessalonians, he says, "not because in themselves frauds and illusions," "but because they are wrought to support the kingdom of lies." He further adds: "Thus it seems that at each great crisis and epoch of the kingdom the struggle between the light and the darkness, which has ever been going forward, comes out into visible manifestation."

Other scriptures even more decisive are these: "And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he has power to do in the sight of the beasts." (Rev. xiii., 14.) "For they are the spirits of devils working miracles." (Rev. xvi., 14.) "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had the mark of the beast." (Rev. xix., 20.)

These scriptures certainly recognize diabolic miracles. In view of such recognition, how can we say that an effect, to be a miracle, must prove that what he says who works it has the divine sanction? Still further, how can it be claimed that man is bound to the doctrine by the miracles alone?

Before dismissing this branch of the subject it is worth remarking that in the time of Christ the Jews unquestionably believed there was a kingdom of darkness, whose servants were competent to the working of miracles. They openly charged the Savior with casting out devils through Beelzebub, the prince of the devils; and the Savior, in his reply, tacitly acknowledges such power as belonging to Beelzebub. How easily he could have undeceived them if they were in error; instead of which, he simply showed them the absurdity of the charges by pointing that the prince of the devils would be destroying his own kingdom. Such a course on the part of Satan would be suicidal.

That these arguments are sufficient to show that we are not absolutely bound by the miracle as a final proof, irrespective of other considerations, will be conceded by those who see no reason why the

miracles should be exalted above the other Christian evidences. They have abundant corroboration in the Scriptures. Man is to examine the doctrine, to see whether it comes from God. Revelation presupposes man's capacity to receive it and to judge of its quality. The inspired teachers appealed to the conscience, to the moral nature of man, and touch there a responsive chord. There is great significance in the words of the Jews, who said: "These are not the words of him that hath a devil."

Not only do the miracles bear testimony to the doctrine, but the doctrine bears testimony to the miracle. "Christ spake as man never spake," as well as wrought as man never wrought. The most powerful appeal in the advocacy of Christ, after all, is to the heart: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." I quote an admirable passage from Trench:

"The miracles have been spoken of as though they borrowed nothing from the truth which they confirmed, but those truths everything from them; when, indeed, the true relation is one of mutual interdependence, the miracles proving the doctrines and the doctrines approving the miracles, and both held together for us in a blessed unity in the person of Him who spoke the words and did the works, and through the impress of highest holiness, and of absolute truth and goodness, which that person leaves stamped on our souls. So that it may be more truly said that we believe the miracles for Christ's sake, than Christ for the miracle's sake."

And another, from Dr. Arnold: "You complain," he says in one of his letters, "of those persons who judge of a revelation, not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence, and that miracles wrought in favor of what was foolish or wicked, would only prove Manichæism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world, that the character of any supernatural power can only be judged by the moral character of the statements which it sanctions. Thus only can we tell whether it be a revelation from God or from the Devil."

What, then, it will be asked is the place in Christian Cyclopædia of the Christian miracles? What their place in the gospel scheme? In the first place, they are intended to arrest attention, to secure a reception of the message to be delivered. They put the messenger in the alternative of being from heaven or from hell; he wields, at least, supernatural power. In the second place, they confirm the word that has already found lodgment in the heart. It is noteworthy that the words of Christ come before his works. He spoke before he wrought. When the apostles went forth upon their mission, the Lord worked with them, confirming their words with signs following.

I have written thus at length, because I see in the article on "*Ecce Homo*" a disposition to exalt the miracle to a place in Christian

apologetics which does not belong to it. But this disposition is not confined to the writer. It is shared by many of the Christian teachers of this generation, though not by so many as in the last. It is the impress left on the century by the "Evidential School," as it is termed, of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. For the purpose of silencing the deists, the apologist of that school resorted to a mode of proof not in harmony with the genius of the gospel. They sought to demonstrate the truth of Christianity, not seeing that in this way they left no play for the emotional nature. The modes of reasoning resorted to savored too much of the mathematical and the fixed sciences. It is true they won the fight. Even Lecky, in his *History of Rationalism*, confesses that their victory was complete; but it was stooping to conquer. To make their appeal, they went down from the high ground where spiritual truth appeals to the soul of man, to the lower ground where signs and wonders appeal to his sense. In this century we are beginning to come back to Christ's own way of approaching men. We are learning that Christianity is not susceptible of demonstration.

Furthermore, we are learning that in the Scriptures miracle has no such superiority over other kinds of evidence, or has ever claimed for it. *A priori* it would be very strange if in a dispensation of grace and of truth the highest proofs should appeal only to sense. It is not so. The very thought is a reproach to Christ and a slur on the gospel.

The superiority of the moral to the physical evidences is recognized in the Scriptures over and over again; and so is the superiority of deeds of charity to the possession of spiritual gifts. A few passages are cited in proof. Christ says, in the sermon on the mount: "Many will say unto me in that day: 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works?' And then will I profess unto them: I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity;" while the man who "heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them" is compared to him who builds "his house upon a rock." It was to certain of the Scribes and Pharisees, who came about him with a morbid hungering for signs, that the Savior said: "An evil and an adulterous generation seeketh after a sign," which is certainly saying by implication that a righteous and a spiritual generation would prefer to listen to the "gracious words" that came from his lips. Again: he recognizes the communication of the divine life as the highest miracle. "He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do, because I go to my Father. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son." And again he says: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one

rose from the dead." There is a significance, of which too many seem not to be aware, in the words which he spoke to Thomas: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed; blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." While Paul, in charging home upon the Corinthians their fearful shortcomings, uses these words: "And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing."

I am far from saying that miracle has no place in the advocacy of Christ; I am only anxious that it be not exalted to a place which does not belong to it. In almost all cases of a successful presentation of the gospel, I am persuaded the effectual appeal has been made to the heart through the word, and not through the miracle. Indeed, I can conceive that had Christ come to guide and save beings who viewed the divine from a higher spiritual altitude, he might not have resorted to miracle at all; and there is perfect truth in affirming that in making an appeal to sense he simply accommodated himself to the weakness of human nature.

The soul of man is receptive of the truth; otherwise God could make no lodgment in the heart. But all who have had experience in preaching the gospel know that there are different degrees of receptivity. Some throw open the door of their heart so soon as they hear the Savior's knock and recognize his voice; some let him stand without waiting long; some never let him come in and sup with them. So it was when Christ was on the earth. The hearts of some recognized at once his voice as the voice of God; deep called unto deep; and they waited for no wonder-working. The hearts of some were so heavy, that many lessons were needed, accompanied by displays of miraculous power. The hearts of some were so entirely callous, that both words and works were of no avail. But generally, if not in all cases, the measure of the Savior's success was found in the state of the heart, and not in the number or the magnitude of his miracles.

Neander, in his *Life of Christ*, recognizes, and, as I think, with great propriety, three stages of faith. He then defines the first: "On the lowest stage stood those who, instead of being drawn by an undeniable want of their spiritual natures, impressed by the power of God working within them, had to be attracted by a feeling of physical want, and by impressions made upon their outward senses. Yet, like his heavenly Father, whose providence leads men to spiritual things even by means of their physical necessities, Christ condescended to their human weakness, sighing, at the same time, that such means should be indispensable to turn men's eyes to that which lies nearest to their spiritual being. 'Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.'"

The second he defines thus : " A higher stage was occupied by those who were, indeed, led to seek the Messiah by a sense of spiritual need, but whose religious feelings were debased by the admixture of various sensuous elements. As these were yet in some degree in bondage to sense, and sought the Savior without perfectly apprehending him as the object of their search, they had to be led to know him by miracles suited to their condition. Such was the case with the apostles generally before their religious feelings were purified by continued personal intercourse with Christ. He condescended to their condition in order to lead men from it to a higher stage of religious life ; but yet represented it as subordinate to that purer stage in which they should receive the whole impression of his person, and obtain useful instruction of the mode in which God dwelt and wrought in him. Jesus said unto Nathaniel : " Because I said, I saw thee under the fig-tree, believest thou ! Thou shalt see greater things than these. Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man."

And the third stage thus : " A far loftier stage of faith was that which, proceeding from an inward living fountain, did not wait for miracles to call it forth, but went before, and expected them as natural manifestations of the already acknowledged God. Such a presupposed faith, instead of being summoned by the miracles, rather summoned them, as did the pagan centurion whom Christ offered to the Jews as a model. " I have not seen so great faith, no, not in Israel."

Undoubtedly some minds can be reached only through the miracles studied in the light of history and criticism ; but a far larger number will be reached through a simple and earnest presentation of Christ, who will be to their minds his own evidence.

I dissent from the general tone of the article on " Ecce Homo." It seems to me relatively to exalt the miracle. For instance : " Now on these miracles rests the whole superstructure of Christianity. It stands only with them, or with them goes down." This in itself is true ; and yet the same may be said of many other things with equal and even with greater truth.

This supreme reliance on miracles is a thing of recent origin. Apostolic preaching is a stranger to it. While Peter's argument on Pentecost from the prophets was quite elaborate, all he said on miracles is compressed by the historian into a single verse. And in this respect the other apostolic sermons are like the Pentecostal. Again : the Christian apologists of the second century are strangers to it. Miracle finds a place in these writings, but not the disproportional place it finds in the apologetics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We find it first in the works of the evidential school, whose writings tinge to some extent the apologetics of this century. Their custom was to fill a volume with the historical evidences, and

then to throw in a chapter or two on the internal evidences, with the slightest possible attention to the character of Christ. But the better writers of this century are reversing this method. They unfold the interior evidences ; they hold up the gospel as being self-evidencing ; and, above all, they insist that the every word and deed of Jesus proclaims him the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. Men begin to appreciate that the gospel is the "wisdom" of God as well as the "power" of God ; and to realize the blessed truth that is getting farther from the age of miracles and nearer the heart of Christ.

Had I not thought the question raised very important in its bearings upon our work of presenting Christ to the men of this generation, I should not have taken up my pen at all. All that I have written is submitted in the hope that it will not, at least, impede the progress of truth.

B. T. HINSDALE.

OF the preceding article I have only to say, I regret to feel it to be unfair to a degree which entitles it to no reply at my hands. It is published as a sample of the dreamy, hazy work now being done by a class of men who, I fear, have more sympathy with *Ecce Homo* than with the editor of the *Quarterly*. These men are very sentimental, and have little use for miracles. Indeed, miracles are altogether too vulgar a thing for their refined tastes. Had the Master been confided to their keeping, he would never have been permitted to work the useless things. But he was not ; *and did work them*. Since that day they have always stood much in the way of *Ecce Homos*.

In the article on *Ecce Homo* occurs one error, which the editor craves leave here to correct. It should have been corrected before it went into the hands of the printer, and was intended to be, but was unhappily forgotten. In speaking of a miracle it was there said : "Its nature must be such as to show that it springs wholly from benevolence and kindness ; and in all cases it must be beneficial *to the subject of it*." The clause here placed in italics is wrong, and should have been omitted. The sentence should have ended thus : "and in all cases it must be beneficial." On reading the article a second time, the error was noticed and placed in memorandum to be corrected, but was afterward lost sight of. I regret that it should have gone into print, and avail myself of the earliest possible opportunity to correct it. It is the only weak point in the article, yet it was not noticed by the author of the preceding.

O. ON THE EDITOR'S THEORY OF THE MILLENNIUM.

IN the last number of the *Quarterly* appears a studied, well-written paper, by Bro. O., on the editor's theory of the millennium. In a brief note appended to that paper I promised a contingent reply in the present number. I now proceed to the fulfillment of that promise.

As far as I can judge, O.'s article is marked by faultless candor and fairness. His obvious aim is the truth. True, I do not think his mode of replying to the editor's theory the proper one. Yet it is the one he has selected, and no doubt for the precise reason that it seemed to him the best and most pertinent. Obviously O. objects to the editor's theory—objects to it on the ground that it is both wrong and dangerous. The proper mode of reply, then, was to file, numerically and refutatively, his objections. This done, he should then, in lieu of the editor's theory, have presented what he believed to be the true theory of the millennium. The two theories would then have stood side by side with each other; and the reader could have been left to form his own judgment as to their relative claims to confidence. But O. sees fit to construct for the editor a series of affirmative propositions, on which it is alleged his theory rests, and to call on the editor for their proof. Now the editor is not sure that this is right. If the editor had anything to *affirm* on the millennium, the editor modestly thinks he himself could have affirmed it. But the editor did not wish to affirm anything. He felt diffident and cautious. All he had to present was a theory. Had he had more, he would have presented it. Now to call on him to affirm each material item in a mere theory, and to prove it, gives to the subject the very form the editor was studious to avoid. Dogmatism and confident affirmation were the very errors the editor hoped to shun. He felt that discussions on the millennium had already been too much marred by these. He did not propose to mar his own discussions by them. Did O. object to the editor's theory? Why not simply so declare, and here let the matter end. Does O. know what the millennium is? Let him, then, so affirm and so prove, and the question is at rest. O. does not believe the editor can prove the propositions he constructs for him. Why, then, did he construct them? The editor feels that he holds a slight advantage in the modest form he gave his piece. That advantage he is not yet in a condition to yield. He has still only a *theory* of the millennium. He is not yet ready for *affirmations*. Still, the editor proposes to take up and discuss the chief points made in O.'s piece; but he does not propose to *affirm* them. He will discuss them only as

probabilities, or as items in a mere theory ; and in the form in which he discusses them he proposes to leave them to the thought of the reader.

I shall first consider the question, *Is Christ to return in person to this earth?* On this question surely I need not pause long. That it can be denied I know ; but how or on what ground, by him who believes the New Testament, it is impossible to understand. The following scripture sets the question at rest : "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, who also said : Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven ? This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts i., 9-11.)

In this passage a few items deserve special attention. The disciples literally see Christ as he ascends from them. There is here neither vision nor dream, but actual literal cognizance by the eye. His form is literally seen, and as literally his departure. On this doubt can not arise. Now in the same manner in which his departure occurred is his return to occur. Was that literal ? So must this be. To deny this is impossible without destroying the credibility of the sacred volume. The ascent is spoken of in the simplest language that could have been used. In language of the same kind is the descent mentioned. The manner of that is declared to be the manner of this. Hence a literal personal descent is actually asserted in so many words in the New Testament. To deny it would be as fatal to the truth of the Bible as to deny the ascent. They both stand on the same ground. That is a past fact divinely recorded ; this a future fact recorded in like manner. If the Bible is to be accepted for that, then must it be for this. The literal personal return of Christ, then, to this earth, I shall henceforth in this article treat as a settled point. To the same effect, as is well known to every Bible student, other passages might be adduced. But the preceding asserts, indisputably asserts, the precise question in issue, and is therefore enough. He who would deny the literal personal return of Christ to this earth with the preceding passage before him, would deny it if it were asserted in every verse in the Bible.

Second, *What will be the state of the world when Christ comes?* Precisely, in my judgment, what it is at the moment of this writing, or, if not precisely the same, it may perhaps be a little worse. To this opinion I strongly incline, but feel not certain. Better I am sure the world will never grow. Locally and temporarily changes will be constantly going on—sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. But substantially the world is

to-day what the world will be up to the moment of Christ's return. Human nature is now what it will be at the end. It will not improve ; in degeneracy it can hardly get lower. Through to the last this nature will have the same Devil to contend against it has always had. He will not grow better ; hardly can he become worse. As the end of his bad career approaches, of which it appears from the Scriptures he will have knowledge, his malice may flame higher, and his work be done in a shorter time and with a more violent hand. This may render the world a little worse than at present ; but other changes I do not anticipate. The gospel is all that is left to improve the human family. More than it has done in time gone we may not expect it to do in time to come. To what, then, are we to look for any improvement in the condition of the world ? I confess I expect none.

But the power of Satan is to be curtailed, we are fondly told. I know it is, but never before the return of Christ. Up to that event Satan will be still himself ; and no diminution of his fearful power will take place. After that he is to be disrobed of power and degraded, but not before. But of this more further on. To assume that God is allowing Satan to exert his undiminished power on the present age to effect its ruin, but that for future ages he will curtail that power, seems to me to be a virtual charge against him of partiality for future ages. Can he do for those ages, with no change of dispensation, what he does not for this, and be free from the charge ? I do not see how. Clearly the notion that Satan's power is to be curtailed in the interest of future ages is but a dream of those who have been brought to convert a wish into a faith. No foundation exists for the notion.

But sectarians tell us that the power of the gospel is to be greatly increased ; and that thus the altered condition of the world is to be effected before the return of Christ. But where is the proof of this ? Clearly it has no existence independent of the imagination. The gospel is an immutable unit. No change can ever take place in it. It is to-day "*the power of God for salvation to every one who believes.*" More than this it will never be to any one. If any man is ever saved, it will be by the gospel as it has been and as it is, not as it may hereafter be. The gospel with its power to save augmented would be a new thing, and no longer the gospel of Christ. To all it must remain the same. It must not be simply itself to one, and something more to another.

But we are still told that the improved condition of the world is to be effected through the Jews. This I know is with many a cherished theory. How much truth there is in it I shall not venture to pronounce. In it, I am frank to say, my confidence is small. Through the Jew surely something is to be done ; but what or how much it is not easy to say. The subject is entitled to concentrated thought.

The Jews, many hold, are to be gathered back to the land of their fathers, and thence are to go out as missionaries to preach the gospel in all the earth ; and thus the world is to be prepared for the return of Christ.

The return of the Jews to Judæa is with me far from being a postulate. It may be true ; but if so, the evidence is not in my possession. In this surely no wish is felt to dogmatize. I am simply without faith, and hence can not give expression to it.

Why, in the first place, are the Jews in dispersion ? Clearly for rejecting the Messiah. This is the cause. Now since for this cause God dispersed them, beyond doubt, for this cause he will keep them dispersed. The cause continuing, so will the effect. As long as they continue to repudiate the Christ, so long will they continue to be what they at present are—a rejected and scattered people. For “unbelief” they were cast off ; for unbelief they will remain cast off. Nothing, I think, can be more conclusive than this. Hence I have not the semblance of belief that the Jews will ever be permitted to return to the land of their fathers so long as they persist in rejecting the Messiah.

But will not time at last lift the vail from their hearts ? And then will they not accept the Messiah ? Many of them, I believe, will ; but I have no faith in the universal conversion of Jews to Christianity. They rejected Christ when he stood in their presence and they looked on him—rejected him when his splendid miracles flashed in quick and countless succession the truth of his claims into their minds—they rejected him then. If now they rejected him when they saw him, and had the sensible proofs of his pretensions, where is the evidence that they will all turn to him when they can not see him, and when this evidence is no longer sensible ? Improbabilities here become great. Time will, no doubt, at last cure their fatal delusion that the Messiah is yet to come. Their souls will in the end grow sick of waiting. All expectation will die in their bosoms. Slowly the truth that the Messiah has already come and been rejected by them, will take possession of their minds. Many of them will turn to Christ ; many will remain infidels ; and all will be cut up into sects and parties as are so-called Christians at present. When the time comes for them to turn to the Lord, Satan will not be idle. He will see to it that division, with all its attendant evils, shall track them up to and into the kingdom.

Most probably they will become what the parties are where they first believe in the Savior. Christianity was not kept pure by them at the first ; it will not be kept pure by them when they embrace it again.

But when they become Christians will they not then return to Jerusalem ? Why so think ? The wish to return is a fleshly feeling, and belongs to them as Jews. When they turn to Christ, in whom

there is neither Jew nor Greek, will they still cherish this feeling? They will then be Christians, not Jews. They will hence feel as Christians, act as Christians, and not as Jews. When they cease to be Jews and become a new creation, the old feelings of the Jew will die with the old man, and the new feelings of the new creation will take their place. Why, then, will they want to return to Jerusalem? They want to go back as Jews; but why go back as Christians? No necessity can demand it; no reason will determine it; nor can any good grow out of it. Hardly will it ever occur.

But what do the Jews want to go back for? Clearly to rebuild Jerusalem; to rebuild the temple and re-establish its service; to revive their priesthood, rear up their altars, and reoffer their sacrifices. But this, as Christians, they could never do. They might rebuild their city; but all else must be left undone. And what would be Jerusalem to a Jew without the temple, the priest, and the sacrifice? They could not revive the law of Moses and live under it as their civil polity. As a ritual they could not use it; its ceremonies they could never re-enact. They could only be there what Christians are here; wherefore then return? They could not keep their ancient Sabbath, slay their paschal lamb, rejoice in the new moon, nor come up to the feast of tents. The truth is, when the Jews become Christians, so utterly altered will their condition be, their views, their feelings, and their lives, that there exists no more reason why they should return to Judæa than for Gentiles going there. Between them and Gentiles no distinction can exist. The middle wall of partition must then lie on the ground. The handwriting of ordinances will be out of the way. Why, then, should they, more than Gentiles, want to leave the lands in which they have been born and raised, and go to live in Canaan? They would be strangers in it, as much so as would Gentiles be. It is hence difficult to see why they should want to return.

That there are passages in the prophets which seem to teach that Israel is to return to the ancient land I well know; but these passages may have been fulfilled in too many other events to justify us in confidently affirming that they point to a great Jewish return. Prophecy often has a double meaning. The same announcement may have two or even more fulfillments. Like a principle in mathematics, many individual cases may be referred to it and solved by it, yet the principle is one and remains the same. The same prophetic statement may be made to cover a series of future events. It may be fulfilled in any one, or it may be fulfilled only in all. In such cases it is difficult to say when its meaning is exhausted, and when it is to be no longer used. Those prophecies which are supposed to teach the universal return of the Jews may relate to other dispersions, partial or complete, and hence have been fulfilled in other

returns long since past. At least, to my mind, the mode of interpreting them is not sufficiently unerring to necessitate the conviction of a great general return of the Jews.

Besides, I strongly incline to think that the notion of a general Jewish return is stood against by passages of the New Testament. Take for example the following : " Jesus saith to her : Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. Ye worship ye know not what ; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth ; for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." (John iv., 21-24.)

Clearly the Savior here points to a time when Jerusalem should be no longer necessary to the successful worship of God ; a time when, in other words, mere locality should form no element in the true religion. If now one place under Christ is no more necessary to the true worship than another, why, when the Jews become obedient to Christ, should they more desire Jerusalem as a place of worship than elsewhere ? The human spirit, and not Jerusalem, is now the ground from which the true worship goes up to God ; the truth, and not the law, the rule that regulates it. Why, then, desire Judæa more than America ? Christians now never move to find a place where they may the more acceptably worship God. They may move from persecutions, but this is a different matter. One place is felt to have no advantage over another. What, then, can exist when Jews become Christians, to determine them to seek Judæa ? Well may we repeat, what ?

Again : allow that the Jews are to become Christians, and to return to Judæa. Will the Gentile Christians go with them ? They can not ; for the land could not contain them. Jews alone, then, would dwell there. But would not this produce exclusivism, and be destructive of that very feeling of fraternity which is ever to exist among the children of God ? Would it not be again to rear the barrier between Jew and Gentile, and to revive the jealousies and hatreds of the long past ? Under this arrangement Christian Jews would become simply Jews ; Gentiles would again stand to them as dogs ; and a state of things would ensue utterly at war with the spirit of Christ. There is wisdom in that feature of Christianity which provides neither for a Gentile nationality nor a Jewish nationality. In Christ all are one. Here, therefore, there can be no nationalities, no grades, no castes. Christianize the Jews first, and then nationalize them ; and in their nationalization their Christianity would soon perish. In my candid opinion, God never intends that Israel shall again become a localized and united people. Separate and scattered they now are ; united in

Christ they may become, but scattered, as a people is to be their fate forever.

As to their becoming missionaries—this I hope may happen. I think they would make the best on earth. But this creates no necessity to return to Jerusalem. Are they ever to become Christians? Then and there at once let them go to work. Why go to Jerusalem? What advantage could this give them? There they could learn nothing; in no way become better fitted for their work. Like Paul, when converted let them go not up, neither confer with flesh and blood, but at once preach Christ. This, to me, falls nearer the true conception of Christianity than a vast nationalization in Judæa.

The world then may perhaps justly expect something from the Jew; but I believe it can well afford to keep its expectations within moderate bounds. I confess my expectations are not high. But even granting that the Jew is to accomplish much; then to this much add the work of the Gentile, and still the relative disproportion between Christians and those not Christians will be so great as to render no material alteration necessary in my original assertion. The world will be when Christ comes about what it is to-day. After the most careful study of the Holy Scriptures with reference to this precise point, I am still left with this belief in mind.

The following is my next question: *What fate awaits the wicked at Christ's return?* That wicked men are to continue up to that time; and that they will hence of course then be here, is a proposition I do not remember to have seen denied. Certainly it is susceptible of the most ample proof. Here, however, it will simply be taken for granted. But the question is what will then become of them? Converted they certainly will not be. When Christ steps from the mediatorial throne the work of redemption is at an end. No soul of man will be saved after that. He then comes to be admired in the saints and to execute judgment, but not to save. That work will then be past. The fountain of his blood will then have been dried, and the last sin blotted that is ever to be. Preachers will then cease their work, and baptisms will occur no more. What, I repeat, will then become of the wicked? Will they still remain to carry on their wickedness? To me it seems highly improbable. That wicked men and the risen saints will ever tread this earth together seems the height of incongruities. It may be so, but it strikes me strangely now.

Perhaps a few passages of Scripture may aid us in our solution of the question as to the fate of the wicked. I cite first the following: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." (2 Thess. ii., 8.)

This passage relates not to the whole of the wicked, but to so many of them only as are represented in the "man of sin." What end

awaits them ? The answer to this specific question is most probably the answer to the general question respecting the wicked. Now that the man of sin is to be *destroyed* is actually asserted. It is hence certain. He is to be *consumed* and *destroyed* ; he is, in other words, to be brought to an end ; his existence is to cease, not absolutely, but as ceases a man when he dies. He is to cease as to the present state, to be no more of it. When the consuming and destroying are at an end, he will be as to earth no more. But the man of sin is an official character, lawless as to Christ, and, as already said, the representative of a class. The fate which awaits him is the fate which awaits those to whom he is a spiritual head, and whom he governs. But those to whom he is this head are countless as to numbers. Hence actual, literal destruction awaits countless numbers of the human family. But this destruction is to take place at the coming of Christ, and is to be effected by it. And this coming is to be held to be the literal personal second coming of Christ. It is an unqualified coming, is explained by no epithets, and hence can have no other reference. It is not coming in his kingdom, coming in power, coming by another, or in any representative form ; but coming himself in his own person. Hence at the coming of Christ vast numbers of the human family are actually to be destroyed—be destroyed suddenly, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye. As soon as Christ in his brightness flashes on the world, they will fall. This will be their end. Pulseless they will lie in an instant. Nor is this death to be metaphorical ; it is to be literal. Neither is it to relate simply to power ; it relates to the person. The *man* of sin, both in office and in person, is to die. Every trace of him is to pass away. His power and those ruled by it will in the same instant cease to be.

This lawless one, this man of sin, I believe to be the Pope of Rome, and such the end that awaits him. Hence, as long as the kingdom of Christ endures in its present form, he will stand. Not till the children of God cease to dwell in the flesh will he be no more. Those persons, therefore, who are at present fondly expecting his immediate end may moderate their expectations, unless they are prepared to hail the return of Christ. With that return stands bound up the fall of popery. On it will continue up into that day. Never will it cease before.

Now the end which awaits the hosts of this lawless one, hosts still countless in number and fearful in power for evil, is, I repeat, most probably the end which awaits all the rest of the wicked. If so, the question, What will become of the wicked at the return of Christ ? is answered. *They will be destroyed.* This is my faith, but it needs further confirmation. Accordingly I next cite the following :

“But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they

were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away ; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." (Matt. xxiv., 37-41.)

Here indisputably the state of the world at the coming of Christ is compared with the state of the world at the flood. At the flood the world was as it had been before. At the coming of Christ the world will be as it now is. The world was not expecting the flood ; the world will not be expecting Christ. The wicked of the world were destroyed by the flood ; the wicked of the world will be destroyed at the coming of Christ. If these be not the points compared in the passage, it is difficult to say which they are.

But, if possible, still more clearly is the destruction of the wicked at the coming of Christ foretold in the following passage : "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write to you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, peace and safety, *then sudden destruction cometh upon them.*

Now the very point before the apostle's mind which drew forth this passage is the second coming of Christ. The time referred to is when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven." Nothing could be more certain than this. The chief events then to occur are minutely mentioned, and among them specially the end of the wicked. The descent itself is to come on the world as comes the thief in the night. None of the wicked will be expecting it. On the contrary, their song will be peace and safety. How complete their delusion ! While the lullaby of peace is yet in their lips and ere the note of safety is hushed, *destruction* is on them, sudden destruction, final destruction. Proof more conclusive than this could hardly be asked. Here, therefore, the destruction of the wicked at the coming of Christ is taught, is actually and clearly asserted. I shall hence, from this on, hold it as settled. To the same effect several other passages might be cited ; but these, with him for whom the Bible can decide anything, are enough. Still I shall add the following :

"Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot ; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded ; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." (Luke xvii., 28-30.)

How, then, will it be when the Son of man is revealed ? Indisputably as it was in the days of Lot ; and in that day *the wicked were destroyed*. They heeded not the warning of Lot, nor looked for the fatal day. Yet, though they expected it not, it burst on them, and in an instant they were dead. Is not such the fearful doom which awaits the wicked at the return of Christ ? Possibly it may not be ; but if not, then is exegesis of the preceding scriptures difficult.

Again : let the reader pause a little on the following curious passage : "I tell you, in that night there shall be two men in one bed ; the one shall be taken, the other left. Two women shall be grinding together ; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two men shall be in the field ; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

Here is food for the thoughtful mind. What mean this taking and leaving ? When Christ comes, two men will be in one bed ; the one will be taken, that is, *will die*, the other will be left to meet Christ and will be changed. Two women will be grinding at the mill, the one will die in an instant, the other will be left to be clothed in that spiritual body which awaits the faithful at Christ's return. Both by Luke and Matthew, what is here said is pinned down to the coming of Christ. Whatever the passage means, it is something which will then take place. I see not what its meaning is, if it be not the preceding.

Therefore, from all the premises now before me, and from others not herein adduced, I conclude that the world will be at the coming of Christ just what it is to-day, little better, little worse ; and as to the wicked, that they will then all die, and die in an instant. This conclusion I believe to be necessitated by the word of God. To many, perhaps to most of my readers, it will seem new and false ; but it stands or falls, not by its novelty, but by the truth. If by this it is not sustained, none is asked to receive it.

Having now disposed of the questions as to the state of the world and the fate of the wicked at the coming of Christ, I next proceed to consider what will be the destiny at that time, first, of the righteous living ; and second, of the righteous dead.

First, as to the righteous living. On this point the following scripture is minute and final : "Behold, I show you a mystery ; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

The time, then, is never to come when all the children of God will be dead. They, that is, some of them, as at present, are to live on, on into the last year, the last month, the last week, the last day, the last hour, the last moment ; and then they are not to die, but to be changed. They are to exchange these mortal bodies for those spiritual bodies, or rather, these bodies are to pass into or become those. For we do not merely drop this body and assume a different body which never was this ; but this body is changed into that. That body will be identical with this, except that this ceases to be mortal and corruptible, and becomes spiritual. Of the nature of this change further than it is here expressed we know nothing.

And to this fact, the fact that the saints are never all to die, I believe the Savior referred in his memorable reply to Peter, when in speaking of the church he said, "the gates of the unseen shall not prevail against it." The statement is a pledge against death, and therefore of the church's perpetuity. "Gates of the unseen" is an expression to be construed as relating first to death, second to the grave. These are the gates into the unseen. The spirit goes out in death; the body in the grave. Beyond these all is unseen. But these gates are not to prevail against the church; her children, in other words, are never all to die. Those of them who live on, and many of them will, to the coming of Christ, will be changed, changed as said by the apostle, and as now already explained. Paul's statement, therefore, is but the expansion and explanation of the Savior's. The one is the supplement of the other.

Hence, at the coming of Christ all the living saints will be changed, changed and made as perfect as they will ever be throughout the countless ages of eternity. Beyond the moment of entrance into those spiritual bodies no further change will occur. As to man this will be the end of change. From that on he will be immutable. This change, moreover, is to take place *at the last trump*; and this will be the moment of Christ's return. The time of the change, therefore, is fixed, fixed at the coming of Christ. I hence deem the case as to the living saints made out.

Second, as to the righteous dead. On this point I cite first the following: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order. Christ the first-fruits, afterward *they that are Christ's at his coming*." (1 Cor. xv., 20-23.)

According to the New Testament, unless I misread it, there are to be three great and distinctly marked resurrections, each standing apart from the other two by long intervening ages. In the preceding passage these separate resurrections are called orders or ranks. Christ, that in all things he may have the pre-eminence, constitutes and exhausts the first rank. He is the first-fruit of them that sleep, and in his rising stood alone. No one else came up with him. The sublimity of the event is unmarred by the presence of others. High, but alone, he stands over the ruins of death. His grave lies empty at his feet. He is the first rank.

But who constitute the second rank? *They that are Christ's*. On this not a doubt can arise. It is actually asserted in so many words in the passage just cited. But who are embraced in the expression *they that are Christ's*? Indisputably all whom he has redeemed by his blood, and who are therefore his. But these include all the right-

eous dead. For no soul of man will ever be saved except through the blood of Christ. This blood, in its efficacy, reached both ways from its shedding—back through all time past, forward through all time to come. Through it life is secured universally to all the ransomed. Hence the expression, *they that are Christ's*, includes every human being of whom it will at last be said, "enter thou." Not even one can be excluded ; it is not possible. The language, *they who are Christ's*, does not mean some who are Christ's, but all who are his, absolutely *all*. Hence all the righteous dead are to wake in the second rank.

But when will this rank be raised ? *At the coming of Christ*. Not one will rise before, not one after. At that very instant every sleeping child of God will spring into life. This again I hold as settled, settled because simply asserted in the Bible. *They that are Christ's at his coming*. Nothing could be clearer than this ; nothing more pertinent. It is final.

Two glorious events, then, will mark the coming of Christ—the resurrection of the righteous dead and the change of the righteous living ; and these events will be simultaneous. They will both occur in the same identical instant. So, at least, teaches Paul : "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord, *shall not precede them who sleep*," that is, we shall not precede them in the change ; we shall not be changed before they are ; we shall both be changed together at the same instant. In the moment in which they wake and put on immortality, we, too, shall be changed and be like them ; we shall all be one. Proud day, happy moment, thrilling hope ! My pen falters and I grow wild as I think of thee, bright, enchanting thing ! But I must curb my feeling.

Here now from independent sources, and by a track of thought entirely different from that pursued in the theory to which my brother O. objects, do I reach the same conclusion there reached, as far as I have gone. The destruction of the wicked was there inferred from that great battle which takes place just after Christ steps from the mediatorial throne, and just before the career of Satan ends for a thousand years. Up to the present time I have not seen reason to abandon the view then expressed. True, there is no literal fight, such as takes place between armies strictly of earth ; neither was anything of the sort there affirmed ; but then there is a fearful event, real as though a literal fight. In this event, Christ and wicked men stand over against each other in hostile array. The result is briefly told. The sword goes out of his mouth ; all the fowls of the air are

filled with their flesh. If this language sets not forth the end of the wicked, of one thing I feel somewhat sure, interpreters will never be able to do more than merely guess its meaning.

Moreover, the universal resurrection of the righteous dead was there inferred from Rev. xx., 4. Subsequent investigation has only served to strengthen the conviction then expressed. I then felt sure the verse admitted, if it did not require, such a construction as necessitated this view. I am now more than ever persuaded that I was right. I then did not believe, neither do I now, that the verse teaches the fanciful notion that only the martyrs will be raised in the second rank, and that all the rest of the pious dead will be left sleeping in their graves till the time of the third rank. For this view I do not believe there is either scripture or reason. But in reply I shall be told that even the martyrs are not to be literally raised; that the resurrection spoken of is figurative; and that only the spirit and heroism of the martyrs will be re-enacted in a set of grand men hereafter to rise; and that this is the meaning of the verse. In plain English, then, there is to be no resurrection in any sense, none literal, none figurative. Only we are hereafter to have a set of men resembling the martyrs in certain respects. This is all. To this I most respectfully decline to reply. When the word of God can be thus dealt with there is an end of certainty in holy writ. We need not trouble ourselves about its meaning more. Let each have his whim; for the Bible decides nothing.

Again: in the theory it was insisted not only that all the righteous dead will be raised at the coming of Christ, but that all the living saints will then be changed; that these two events, in other words, are simultaneous, and limited by positive scriptural assertion to the instant of Christ's return. Hence the two changes and the return all stand bound up together for the same moment. It now appears, from what has herein gone before, that these positions were safely taken. Therefore it seems that so much of the theory as has now been reconsidered may be held as probably true; and more than this it is not proposed to affirm.

If now the reader will turn to the Book of Revelation and read its seventeenth and eighteenth chapters, he will there see that the destruction of Babylon stands closely, if not immediately, connected with the great battle in which the wicked fall, described in the following chapter. Babylon I believe to be but another name for popery. But popery, we have now seen, will be destroyed at the coming of Christ. At that time, it has been herein held, most probably the rest of the wicked will be destroyed. This view now receives confirmation from the fact that the battle and the destruction of Babylon seem to fall in so closely together. Indeed there is nothing to forbid the view that they happen together, and are only separately

described to correspond the more completely with other scriptures in which they are separately named. I feel that there must be at least the semblance of truth in a theory in which so many fragments of scripture meet and blend into one unique and consistent picture.

The next question I raise is as to the binding of Satan. On this point John thus speaks: "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, who is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." (Rev. xx., 1-3.)

In the theory this passage was construed as referring to Satan proper, the real literal Devil. Bro. O. thinks this view "clearly wrong." His language is: "But the editor obviates this difficulty so far as the dragon is concerned. He invariably speaks of him as the Devil and Satan, and evidently understands that it is literally and properly *the* Devil, the grand arch-enemy of God and man, that is alluded to. Now this is more than questionable. It is, as I think, clearly wrong. However devilish, however satanic, the dragon may have been,—and surely no one will call in question his title to these characteristics,—still he was not really and literally the Devil, or Satan, but was 'a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.' He was called the devil, not because he was the Devil, but because he was devilish. He was called satan, not because he was Satan, but because he was satanic. These terms were applied to him for the same reason that the term 'satan' was applied to Peter, 'the devil' to Judas, 'that fox' to Herod, and 'lamb' to Christ; still it is the dragon that is called the devil and satan, not the devil and satan that is called the dragon. If there is any authority for the popular belief that the time will come on this earth when Satan, not the dragon who is figuratively called satan, but literally and truly Satan himself, the spirit that works in the hearts of the children of disobedience, will actually and literally be laid hold upon by an angel, who has come down from heaven with a 'key' and 'a great chain in his hand,' and be bound with that chain, and be shut up in the abyss, when he will cease to lead the wicked captive at his will and to cast his fury-shafts at the righteous, when saints will no longer need to watch and pray lest they enter into temptation, I know not where to find it."

I am startled at this interpretation. Rather let me not call it interpretation. *Ad huc* I see not how it can be shown to differ from repudiation. I know my brother did not so mean it, but it is a fearful blunder. The angel laid hold on *the* dragon, *the* ancient serpent.

But who is this dragon, this ancient serpent? He is *diabolos*—devil. But even this was not deemed enough. He is *diabolos*—devil, *even δ Σατανᾶς, the Satan—Satan himself*; or the identical being who bears that name. If this does not identify the dragon and Satan, and make them one and the same being, then identification is something not in the power of human speech. *Ὁ Σατανᾶς* is never applied in holy writ to any being except the very Devil. It is his own severe title, and never the name of another. The cases adduced by Bro. O. as parallel are not pertinent. We know who Peter was, Herod was, Judas was. We hence know from the nature of the case the sense in which the terms severally applied to them are to be taken. They are not employed to tell us *who* these men were, but *what* they were. But the question in the case in hand is, not what the dragon was, but who he was. We do not know him. The very question in issue is, who is he? He is *δ Σατανᾶς*—the very being Satan himself.

But we have still something more touching this dragon in the twelfth chapter. The passage runs: "And there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his angels, and prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, *called the devil and Satan*, who deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him."

That this dragon is the same dragon on whom the angel is to lay hold, and whom he is to bind a thousand years, I shall not attempt to prove, since O. himself impliedly admits it. But this dragon was once in heaven, and fought there against Michael and his angels. He was cast out of heaven, cast out, and cast into earth; he is the ancient serpent; the being who is called, called in scripture, called by men, the Devil and Satan, to whom these are names—the being who deceives the whole inhabited world. If this is not the true Satan, the real Devil, the great enemy of man—then I have simply to say there is no such being. If I am not to trust the New Testament here, then am I to trust it nowhere.

I hence conclude with John that God's angel is yet to bind the veritable Satan, the real devil, a thousand years. On this conclusion I am firmly planted. But here again we encounter another difficulty. In what sense are we to take the phrase a thousand years? There is but one sense in which it can be taken. It means simply a thousand years—not one more, not one less. It can have no two meanings. If it means not a thousand years, it means nothing. Can it mean ten years? Or can it mean a million? If not a thousand, what does it mean? But why suppose it to mean anything else? Is a thousand years an impossible period? Certainly it may mean a thousand; and since this is what it expresses, surely it is safer to conclude that it means this than what it does not express.

By the binding of Satan I simply understand binding. I know of no other sense in which to take the language. I hence believe that the Devil is hereafter to be literally bound, to be literally cast into the abyss, and there literally kept for the precise term of a literal thousand years. If we have among us wise scribes who know that this is false, and who can deliver us the truth in the case, let them so show and so deliver, and I shall rest content.

But my premises are still not all before me. I am hence not ready to combine and draw conclusions. What next of those two resurrections? On this point O. thus speaks: "It may be difficult to prove, by any fair reasoning and correct exegesis of Scripture, that there are literally to be two resurrections—that of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and that of the wicked at its close."

There is not the semblance of difficulty in the case. The Scriptures roundly and undeniably assert two resurrections; and if their assertion is not to be taken for two, neither is it for one. But before proceeding further I will here insert Green's translation of the passage: "And I saw thrones; and they sat on them; and judgment was given to them; and I saw the souls of those that had been beheaded on account of the witness of Jesus and on account of the word of God, and such as had not homaged the beast nor his image, and did not receive his mark on their forehead and on their hand; and they came to life, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended. This is the first resurrection." (Rev. xx., 4-5.)

Here now John tells us that he saw the souls of certain persons, and tells us who these persons were. He describes them both affirmatively and negatively; they were both the martyrs and such as were not. Clearly they are the souls of the righteous dead. Now these dead (not merely their souls, for these never die) *came to life*, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. This is *the first resurrection*. But it has already been shown in this article that at the coming of Christ *all* who are his will rise. The very form of speech used to express the idea precludes any other supposition. But here indisputably are persons who are Christ's, and they come to life. At this time, then, will come to life all who are Christ's. This, therefore, is the time of Christ's coming. But this is the commencement of the thousand years. Hence, at the commencement of the thousand years Christ will return, and all who are his will wake to life. But this thousand years is the millennium. Therefore at the commencement of the millennium Christ will return to earth, and all who are his will rise to life. But at the moment when the righteous dead arise, the righteous living will be changed. Hence at the commencement of the millennium the whole family of God will be raised and changed—will be perfected. Beyond this they either can not sin or will not. For

those spiritual bodies which they shall then enter will be *incorruptible*; that is, they can not be corrupted. But this they could not be if those who wear them sinned. For so long as a man can sin he not only can, but actually does, corrupt both soul and body. Hence, as to the righteous, these thousand years will certainly be a period of sinless and painless bliss.

But furthermore, during these thousand years Satan will be bound and in prison. He will hence have no power to induce any one to sin, and consequently will induce none. Hence again, as to Satan, the period will be sinless. Consequently, a thousand years on this earth of sinless and painless bliss is nearly made out.

But, further, John says : "The rest of the dead did not come to life until *the* thousand years (τὰ χίλια) were ended." The thousand years, then, at the end of which the rest of the dead will come to life are the thousand years at the commencement of which the righteous dead do come to life, and through which they reign with Christ. But these are the thousand years which I have called a period of sinless and painless bliss. Here, then, they are identified with the thousand years of Revelation twentieth. This my brother O. thinks "indispensable." Is he satisfied ?

But "the rest of the dead did not come to life until the thousand years were ended." This, indisputably, is the second resurrection. Certain (τῶν νεκρῶν) of the dead came to life and reigned with Christ a thousand years. Of course, then, if they, being alive, reigned with Christ a thousand years, they must have come to life at the commencement of this period ; for otherwise reigning through it alive was impossible. This coming to life at the commencement of the thousand years is *the first* resurrection ; that coming to life at its end is *the second*. If now the first is figurative, so is the second ; or if the second is literal, so is the first. Whatever the one is, the other must be. They are both described in the same unqualified language ; hence they must be the same.

But on this point I crave leave to cite the following from Dean Alford's work on the Book of Revelation. He first translates thus : "The rest of the dead lived not [*again* as above] until the thousand years be completed. This is the first resurrection." He then proceeds with his commentary thus : "It will have been long ago anticipated by the readers of this Commentary, that I can not consent to distort words from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the apostles, and the whole church for three hundred years, understood them in the plain literal sense ; and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity complacently casting aside the most

cogent instance of consensus which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where *two resurrections* are mentioned, where certain *ψυχαι ἐξήσαν* at the first, and the rest of the *νεκροὶ ἐξήσαν* only at the end of a specified period after the first,—if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean *spiritual* rising with Christ, while the second means *literal* rising from the grave ;—then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to anything. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain ; but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which, in common with the whole primitive church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain and receive as an article of faith and hope." With this extract I shall close what I have to say on this point. Certainly I feel not a little pride in being found in company with so fine an author as Alford, whose work I had not seen when I penned the theory.

But who are the *λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν*, *the rest of the dead*, who did not come to life till the thousand years were ended ? The answer to this question has already been anticipated in what has now been said. First, I hold it to be actually settled by holy writ that there will be two resurrections of the dead, standing apart from each other a thousand years, one at the commencement of this period, the other at its end ; and second, that at the beginning of these thousand years all the righteous dead, but no others, will be raised. This settles the question, who are "the rest of the dead ?" *They are the wicked dead.* These live not again till the thousand years are ended. They hence constitute the second resurrection.

Of the truth of this I have one or two additional implied proofs to offer. 1. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ also shall all be made alive ; but each in his own rank." (1 Cor. xv., 22, 23.) That the making alive here is making alive from the grave has never, I believe, been called in question. Now let us bear in mind that when Paul wrote this the resurrection of Christ was past. The *πάντες*, then, *the all*, of whom he says "they shall be made alive," are clearly all the dead after Christ. At that time none of these had been raised ; this was yet to take place. They were, in other words, such as have to be made alive "in Christ," that is, by him. This, however, excludes Christ himself, but includes all the rest. Now when Paul adds, "but each in his own rank," his meaning obviously is, each of the *πάντες*—each of all the dead. Hence the human family are not all to be raised at once, but in ranks ; that is, in different ranks—the righteous in their rank, the wicked in theirs. Compare this with John's first and second resurrections, and each passage gains confirm-

ation from the other. The ranks then come into view, and are seen to be two, and very different.

2. "This is the first resurrection. Blest and holy is he that has a share in the first resurrection; over these the second death has no power." This language would seem to imply that over those who have no share in the first resurrection the second death will have power; that is, that they will be subjects of it. This I believe to be both the implication and the truth. The second death will consist in being cast into the lake of fire. Now we happen to be told definitely who those are who will be subject to this death. John says: "And whoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." All those, then, not found written in the book of life will be subject to the second death; and these include all the wicked. But those subject to the second death have no part in the first resurrection. Hence the wicked will not rise in the first resurrection, but in the second. This point in the theory, therefore, seems pretty well settled.

3. But further: at the end of the thousand years Satan is to be released a little season, and is to go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, to gather them together to war. Are any of the righteous among these nations? If not, then clearly they must consist exclusively of the wicked. The following answers the question: "And they [the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth] went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." (Chap. xx., 9.) From this it appears that none of the saints are out among those nations. These saints are all together in the camp and the beloved city. Those nations, on the contrary, come up and compass the camp of the saints. Hence the nations and the saints are not promiscuously mingled together. The saints are to themselves; the nations to themselves. These nations, I hence conclude, are the "rest of the dead" who did not come to life till the thousand years were ended. They are, in other words, the wicked of earth—Satan's old subjects whom he has before fatally deceived, and whom he now deceives again only the more effectually on that account. In that other great battle at the commencement of the thousand years, Satan had arrayed against Christ only the wicked then living. Then his ranks were not full. It is different at the end of the thousand years. Now every wicked human being who has marked earth with his foot is present. Not one is absent. All these are now marshaled for the issue. For it seems to be the purpose of God that all who have withstood the truth and opposed his Son shall confront him in battle array. The question of might; as well as that of right, has to be tried. Those who would not bow simply to his will, must bow to his power. They

declined to be persuaded ; and now it only remains to subdue them by force. Fire comes down from God out of heaven and devours them. This is their end. Now can it be possible that this is Paul's allusion when he says : "*The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ ?*" Possibly there may be less of figure in this language than the world is dreaming of.

Consequently, from all the premises now before me, I conclude that the wicked dead will literally not rise till the end of the thousand years. If not, then during that time there will be no wicked men on earth. Hence the period will be sinless. Therefore the thousand years of sinless and painless bliss, insisted on in the theory, is made out.

But here again we encounter an objection. Righteousness and truth, we are told, must gain the victory, and not mere power ; and that a victory gained by mere power would imply the ultimate failure of truth and holiness. But we must bear in mind that it is of the very nature of all moral influences that they can be resisted. Besides, their ultimate triumph without physical force is by no means clear to my mind. They did not triumph in heaven. Satan resisted them there, and was only overcome at last and expelled by sheer force. They did not triumph before the flood. On the contrary, they were resisted, and God destroyed the resisters. They were resisted by the inhabitants of Sodom ; and destruction by physical force followed. What has been may be again, and most probably will be. The truth will be resisted to the last. It will never of itself prevail. It will be vindicated, but not wholly victorious. Many will remain of whom it must be said : They know not God, neither have they obeyed the gospel. These God will destroy, destroy by mere power. A victory over them by mere moral influences will never occur. If when beings are absolutely pure right can not keep them right, hardly, after they once fall and are under the dominion of sin, can right by itself so far prevail as to stand victor. I expect to see truth and righteousness vindicated ; but I never expect to see them in and of themselves triumph over sin.

A few words more and I have done. My Bro. O. calls on me to "prove," or rather to affirm and prove. Now proof of everything we hold is not always at our command. We hold many things because, upon the whole, they are relatively more probable than the things which rival them. Many items in the theory I am unable to prove. I hold them because I deem them more probable than anything else I have seen. Mere probability, not proof, is all that is at times attainable. On this the prudent man feels safe in acting.

But surely my brother O. will not ask me to do what he is himself

unwilling to be asked to do. He has a theory of the millennium. Here now I call on him to affirm it, item by item, and prove it on the pages of the *Quarterly*. Already I shrewdly divine his theory; and though I am not willing to anticipate him, yet I fear not to hazard the conjecture that, when spread out, it would be difficult to find a more complete concatenation of guesses than it will be. The school to which he belongs has spoken heretofore. But we shall now see the difference between affirming for others and asking them to prove, and affirming for ourselves and proving. I repeat we shall see.

"JESUS WEPT."—In the life of Jesus, as recorded for us by the Spirit, there are two weepings. Twice in the body, and on the earth, the man Jesus Christ shed tears; but in neither case were they shed for himself. Not in Gethsemane, not on the cross, did Jesus weep. Both the sorrows were for our sakes; but they differed widely from each other. When he drew near Jerusalem, and beheld the city, he wept over it; when he saw a bereaved sister mourning for a dead brother, he wept with her. The one weeping was for human guilt; the other was for human sorrow. The one marks his divine compassion for the sinful; the other his human sympathy with the sufferer. Each is precious in its own place, but the places are widely diverse. The two examples exhibit different qualities of the Savior, and meet different necessities of men. His compassion for sinners, manifested in his tears over Jerusalem, is a link in the chain by which we are saved, but it is an upper link; his sorrow with a sister beside a brother's grave is a link lower down, and therefore nearer us. His pity for me as a sinner shows that he is great and good; his weeping with me shows that his greatness and goodness are within my reach. When I could not arise to meet him in the region of his own spiritual compassion, he has bowed down to meet me in my natural weakness. I could not rise to lay hold of him, but he bends to take hold of me. Standing where I stand, and weeping where I weep, he enters by the openings which grief has made into my heart, and gently makes it all his own. My brother, he insinuates himself into me through the emotion of our common nature, that so I may be borne up with him into the regions of spiritual light and liberty. He takes hold of me by my sorrow, that I may get hold of him for deliverance from my sin.—*W. Arnot.*

MODERN PHILANTHROPY.

From a stricken land comes up a cry the most piteous and piercing that has ever penetrated the tingling ear or the answering heart of a prosperous people. Stealing up amid the farmers' talk of last year's abundant crop, the merchants' account of its gains or its losses, comes the pleading prayer of famine,—of dying widows and orphans begging for "bread, bread ! Only for bread !"

While we turn the furrow or measure the yard the very breeze that fans our cheeks, and whispers to our hearts the spring-time story of renewal of life, that bids our blood to leap within our veins, that opens the hearts of the flowers within our gardens, that is blowing wide and far within our orchards the white banners of promise of a fruitful year, has visited the homes of want, has swept the pale brow of the famished child, has kissed its white dry lips, and bears upon its wings the wailing prayers of helpless Christian mothers for "bread, bread !" not for themselves, but "bread" for their dying babes !

This breath of spring, with its genial airs and notes of joy, that with southern softness is gently opening all our doors, and calling our little children, our young men and maidens, our old men and matrons, to the active outer life, has been in the house of woe, has lingered about the bed of disease, nay, thousands of beds of disease, engendered by want. And it bears with it its burden,—a burden of double promises to us, if we heed the prayer of the suffering ; yet, with these promises it brings those vague, mysterious, but not doubtful, intimations and premonitions that are often so strangely and yet so surely the harbingers of coming calamities. And to all, if there be any such among us, so cold and hard as to turn a blank ear and a bleak response to the cry of famishing babes, we only beg them to remember, the longer that cry is unheeded the nearer and nearer it will come wailing around our doors and moaning at our hearth-stones, till our own loved ones may catch the cry, if not of want, at least of disease—disease engendered at first from want, and then spread out on the wings of heaven like the winged messengers of the wrath of God.

And if there be a man or a woman in all this land who to the starving prayer of a child for "bread" can thrust the "stone" of response, that "your parents deserve it," let him or her bear in mind "with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again !" The pestilence may reach you if the famine should not !

But it is not with the openly, defiantly heartless, that this subject of modern philanthropy is to be discussed. It is with those who with

sympathetic hearts and hands and lips are ringing the bells of alarm and blowing the trumpets of relief in the ears of a listening people. It is with many who "give," a few who "would if they could," and some who know not how to "give." And in order to bring the subject nearer home, to confer with those only with whom we have at present a right, let it be borne plainly in mind that it is not with those of the world who give and have a right, so far as Christians may decide, to give in their own way, nor is it with the denominations; it is simply with the people of our own church that we would kindly sit down and commune on this subject. And when in earnest love we have relieved each other's eyes from blinding "beams," we can then see clearly, not only what we do, but in future how to do. And thus, by our own clear-eyed example, show where the "moat" dims many a well-meant but often miscalled "charity" of the age; and by example teach the beautiful lesson of giving—disinterested giving to those who need, and thus receive the wealth-returning love and blessing of the Lord.

With our brethren we would speak plainly but lovingly. We would warn, solemnly but kindly, of a gathering, growing pestilence, in the form and garb of philanthropy, that from without is threatening to invade the church. Nay, in many places already sits down with the faithful; and with the word "charity" written upon its assured and inviting front, bargains, with the soul of Mammon and all the zeal of its devotees, to pay back in pleasures of sense and time, in ringing laugh, in merry jest, and tripping toe, all Christians who may "give" sometimes the merest pittance to its full-blown, rose-hued schemes of "help"—help to their suffering and starving brethren.

Nay, more than this. Wrapped in the cloak of charity, this wolf of modern philanthropy prowls grinningly in at "suppers for benevolent purposes," and invites our innocent sons and daughters to all the excitements incident to gambling tables in form of "raffles," "chances," and "grabs," at "gifts" and gains for themselves; still, however, all to be procured in the service of "charity" in "behalf of the suffering poor."

It is urged in extenuation of the encouragement of these excitements that the sums invested are so small, and the "object" to be attained so "good," that it is a "charitable" enticement; that, indeed, it is "right." And so we simply suggest, on the same principle, and working with the same machinery, may all the lures of lotteries and temptations to invest in faro banks, most appropriately be termed "charitable" and "right." The ultimate object of many a visit to the gaming-house by many a poor tried soul is "good." It is, indeed, to place bread in the waiting mouths of helpless children, and the sum invested is often small, pitifully, pitifully small in value; but large in the waiting agony that hangs upon it. And all the terrible despond-

ency, the helpless degradation, and the weary woe that trails away from these dismal dens, had at first their origin in investments as small and temptations apparently as harmless as any with which the mothers and daughters of the land invite their husbands and brothers to "charitable chances" to "feed the poor."

And there are many full-souled, earnest-hearted, and open-handed Christians who, with the love of loving and the gift of giving, are often wooed and beguiled into the encouragement of all these schemes, because, in the wealth of their goodness, they can not find it within them "to send any empty away." To all such lovers of good and of doing good we can only say: Look well to your own households! In assisting to sow the insidious seeds of what may seem to you "wind," mere wind, in the hearts of your children, you may some day see them bowing in the full ripe harvest of wrath, and with them "reap the whirlwind" of woe. Woe, woe, for the ripened fruits of sin and dissolution, sowed by the hands of modern philanthropists in minute seeds of "charity" upon the rattling wheel and the lottery game of "gifts!" "Gifts to your sons and daughters,"—and all for "the benefit of your starving brethren at the South!"

As an apology for these modern schemes of giving, we are told that by "charitable suppers," "fish-ponds," and "fairs," we have the means of reaching those who otherwise would not render "aid." Look to it, Christian mothers and women of the land! It is you who are responsible! And we beseech you to look closely and earnestly, and decide for yourselves whether for such pitiful pay you will endanger, entice, or sell in the shambles of charitable shams, (or rather in galvanized caterings to the pleasures, flesh, and sense of this life,) all the glorious prospects of a glorious future to precious, noble souls within your keeping. Look to it, we earnestly beseech you!

As to what the world might give and its way of giving, it is always ready and willing to assume the responsibility of doing so in its own time and in its own way. Let Christians, with a similar independence, bring home and lay upon their hearts their own responsibilities. And by the time they have concentrated their study upon and cultivated an intimate acquaintance with their own duty in times of such fearful emergencies as that of the present, they will rise up awe-stricken at the fact of their own delinquency in this very matter. Aye, much as they sit with placidity, congratulating themselves that they have given thus and so, so many dollars and so much corn, for the "benefit of their starving brethren," if they will bring this question home in the right way, in the way that the Savior teaches and humanity demands, they will find the dread questions shuddering through their souls: Have I given as I could? Have I denied myself a single luxury, to say nothing of a single comfort or necessity, in order to save the life of these pleading brethren in the Lord? Have

my own children been denied even a crumb or a ribbon, a superficial ribbon the less, for the sake of saving the life, the dear life, of that hunger-racked babe yonder, held up on the skeleton hand of the widowed mother, before God, in her tortured, prayerful agony? Can it be that, knowing its suffering, God will hold *me* responsible for its life? Great God! can it be possible that in the "coming day the Savior may look me in the face and hold me, *me* responsible for the life of these helpless ones? "Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not to me!" "Whosoever will, let him take up his cross,"—let him "deny" himself! Have I done it? Have I done it?

If Christians will concern themselves with questions of this kind, they will find but little time to "calculate" how much might be "made" off of the fêted, sated sense of men of the world, say by getting up a "supper," or a "fair," "this week," "next week," or "some time when it suits us all." If they will do this, let us delicately but firmly suggest that it will save them the trouble of calculating how much can be "made" toward the purchase of the Lord's blessing, by selling to the sense of men. Or, to be firmer and plainer still, toward buying the Lord, by selling to the "prince of the power of the air," through the "desires of the flesh, and of the mind" of those with whom they would renew "conversation."

Charity, true charity, we are but uttering an axiom, is a soul-expanding, a soul-quickening, a life-giving principle, and inspires at once to action. The true Christian, fully imbued with this principle, springs like the watchman of God, as he surely is, to the relief of the poor, to the help of the sorrowing and suffering. For does he not know that through these means he is to show his love and his loyalty to the Friend of the poor, the Healer of all sorrow? And does he not feel within him the life-giving power of that principle? The living warmth of that fire which is ever burning and ever ready to be laid on the altar of any sacrifice that Christ may demand? What mockery, then, what fearful mockery, for men and women claiming to be Christian, laden down with the blessings of this life, biding their time to laugh and sing, to "sup" and amuse themselves, or the sated world, as the case may be, before they can cast the mere crumbs from their profusion into the mouths of the starving, actually starving widows and orphans! Think of it, philanthropists! Think of it! Filled to satiety with the luxuries of this life, you wait to prepare an elaborate "supper" for yourselves, or your friends, while the thin wasted hand of the widow is outstretched, and the dying voice of the orphan cries in most piteous accents for "bread," for "bread," for "bread." Oh! the mockery of Christians tossing to these their crumbs, their cast-off "calico," the remnants and shreds of their own amusements, and then flaunting in the face of Jesus their silken robes, their jewels, their costly array of all kinds! The bitter, bitter mockery!

Let the world, without hope and without Christ, collect and dispense its charities in any form it choose. The world expects its pay in this life. But for Christians, who profess to be living for the beyond, the infinite, the eternal, to sit in Dives's seat on earth, to dispense merely a pittance from their profusion, the crumbs from their tables as it were, while their brethren starve within their reach ; for them to do this, and after such narrow-handed display to expect when all is over to recline in peace in Abraham's bosom, again we repeat, what mockery ! what mockery ! And need it be added, what bitter, what fearful disappointment awaits all such in the end ! "Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not to me."

And Christians everywhere, may it not be possible that we all deceive ourselves ? We "deny" ourselves here and there it is, doubtless, true ; and we persuade ourselves we are doing God service. But in the midst of all this cry and wail of starvation and agony we go on ; we buy here a little, there a little, here a trifle, there a trifle, for ourselves and our families, that could in the present distress actually be dispensed with, and ourselves and our children barely feel it. And to all who have done this may not outraged conscience well cry out, Have you been lending to the Lord ?

We do not know what it is to be pinched by hunger, much less by cold or by starvation. This skeleton has not knocked at our doors. He has not been in our homes ; and living for ourselves, we do not cause ourselves to see the want and woe we could, if we would, alleviate. We do not think. And therefore while worn and weary mothers have been known to walk miles and miles in the wildest efforts to save the lives of their children from starvation, their Christian brethren go to work to get up concerts, tableaux vivant, and extra suppers, wherewith to bring the world and themselves together, first to amuse each other, and then to send the result of their amusements to the dying, the desolate, the broken-hearted, and call these offerings the offspring of sympathy and philanthropy ! And if the winds could waft to those dying ears our tones of sympathy in the midst of our feasts, what would be the tales they would tell ! And while we sing our songs, mournful or comic, as the case may be, the watching mother wails and pleads and prays ; and while we enact our living tableaux, the piteous infant tugs at her shrunken breast, and tugs in vain, and dies ! Alas ! alas ! while they die, pleading and praying to God for "bread," we, their brethren, eat, drink, and are merry for their benefit. And when the pitiful, pinched lips have prayed their last and are laid in the dust perhaps, then comes our pretentious "charity" to mock their ashes, or, more probably, the heart of the mother that has waited and watched and prayed beside them, and so far as we are concerned have waited and watched and prayed in

It may seem strange to think of and speak of these things in this light. But are they not so in reality? And, after all, is not the reality a stranger, far stranger thing than the thought? Rather, is it not strange that we can not or do not bring these things and these thoughts home to ourselves? The great trouble with many Christians is, they do not think? Ah! they do not think! But in that "great day" who, who is to be responsible for our lack of thought?

Christian mother! pleasantly and patiently busy with the outfit of your little ones for the coming spring, dreamily humming as with nimble hand you adjust the ribbon or stitch the broidery of love out and in and over the garments of the innocent at your knee, look up from your work a moment, we beseech you. Look into those depths of light and love—the eyes of the child beside you. Look! and then ask yourself if those beautiful eyes, with starvation's strain, were looking vainly, dyingly into yours, and those sweet, moist lips were dry as death and barely able to murmur "bread," what would you do? Then ask yourself that other question, What would be your feelings, under such circumstances, to know that thousands of Christian mothers within your reach would prefer even to trim the dresses of their children to saving the life of yours? Ask yourself these questions, and all such questions as these. And if you be wise and true, need we hesitate to add, they will solve how you can "give" if you will. Nay, more, they will teach you how you can "give" without "begging" of the world, to pay your own debts to the Lord; and give without spinning gaming excitements at the raffling-wheel, or diving into the depths of the "grab-bag" or the "fish-pond," for the miserable profit upon ten or twenty cents; "give," without the additional expenditures toward elegant outfits for "skating carnivals," "tableaux vivant," and all that ilk (which expenditure, permit us to hint, if you love the suffering, might help them much); and "give" without laughing, jesting, chaffering over, and trampling under your feet the agonies of starving children, and the pleading, prayerful hearts of mothers, as deep, as tender, as clinging and devoted toward their children as yours can be for yours.

We have applied this question of modern philanthropy as a touchstone to the great piercing, pleading exigency of the day, and a close inspection will find it wanting. And more than this, it reveals what might be considered, were it not for the lack of thought in its votaries, the dread heartlessness of "Christian charities," amusing themselves for the "benefit" and on the capital of the starving. It unveils the face of that "benevolence" which sits by, and laughs and feasts and sings, while the hunger-fiend sucks the blood, strains the staring eye, and pinches the pleading lips of the helpless widow and orphan in a stricken and wrath-scorched land. And deeper in the darkness of this lack of moral thought, it finds and feels the wing of that

hideous vampyre of the age tugging at the veins, and sucking forth the life-blood of Christianity, under the guise and bearing the name of "suppers," "feasts," and "fairs for benevolent purposes." Let those real philanthropists, who love the cause of the suffering, who hold the name of Christ, turn their eyes upon themselves. Above all, let them turn their eyes upon their Leader, listen to his teaching, and learn from his example, "Deny thyself." According to your own capacity, in proportion to the gifts God has bestowed upon you, and in proportion to the sufferer's need, bind more closely and more unflinchingly his motto upon the front of your philanthropy, "Deny thyself." This is the all-conquering cross of love, before which all suffering may be dispelled, all sorrow at last shall flee. It will teach you when to give, where to give, how to give, how much to give. And having learned and practiced the lesson of this philanthropy, the blessing of Jesus will be your reward.

DOUBTINGS.—Friends, doubting friends, what do you gain personally by doubtings? Are you strengthened by them—built up in your holy faith by doubts—are they refreshing to your soul? Rather do not doubts weaken the whole man? Is not doubting a gangrene of the soul, a leprosy, a plague, a palsy? It eats out the life-blood of Christian hope and usefulness. A man that is always doubting his own salvation, is unprepared to point others confidently to "the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world." "Physician, heal thyself," presses upon him like an incubus; his heart faints within him, and one faint heart makes other faint hearts—one faint-hearted soldier on the eve of battle strikes fearfulness into a whole army, and defeats the battle. This is why God commanded Gideon to say to all the doubters or fearful ones in his army, "depart," until the whole number numbered only three hundred, and with these few whole-souled, courageous ones, the whole Midianitish army were routed, and a complete conquest gained.

Doubting has been the curse of ages. The Israelites, by one single act of doubting, were forever excluded the promised land, and left to perish in the wilderness.

The command is everywhere: "Be of a good courage, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." Then "one can chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight." But what saith God to the doubting, "the fearful, the unbelieving?"

SCRIPTURE TYPES—No. 7.

(Concluded.)

NOR are places more than persons devoid of typical significance, and just as we might have placed in our list of typical persons such names as Cain, Ham, Nimrod, Ishmael, Esau, Pharaoh, Absalom, and others, to set forth the dark side of the picture, so here we have Eden, Canaan, Jerusalem, Calvary, and Mount Zion ; but then there are, besides these, places sombre, dark, and gloomy with human sorrow and human sin, resting under the curse of God, and fitting types of hell—the land of Nod, Babylon, Gehenna, and many others. Are not Eden and Canaan but types of heaven? Egypt and Assyria, of anti-Christian powers? Sodom and Gomorrah, of the damnation that awaits the cruel opposers of God and his people? How Mount Moriah, when Abraham the sire and Isaac the son were there, adumbrates Calvary and its tragedy ; and how gloriously does Jerusalem and Mount Zion, whither the tribes go up, on those days of feasting and joy, when Israel, from every nation under heaven, were assembled at the feasts of the Lord, represent the city of our God, and the gathering together of the true Israel from all kindreds and tribes and peoples of the earth ! And so we might go on, for there is scarcely an end to this field.

Times, also, have a significance in typology that is at once instructive and pleasing ; and the same may be said of certain numbers which have ever been regarded as symbolic. To treat these as they deserve would transcend our present limits. It is painfully brief, but it is all we can do now to suggest that the Sabbath, the sojourn in Egypt, the forty years in the desert, the year of jubilee, the years of captivity in Babylon, are all spoken of in Scripture as types, as much so as Jonah's three days in the belly of hell are used by Christ to teach us that he would be three days in hades. The reader may think me weak, or credulous, or superstitious, but I can not withhold the expression of my conviction that there is *something* in numbers as used in the prophecies of holy writ, as well as in the dreams of Pythagoras, the works of nature, and the science of music. I make this declaration with a full knowledge of the fact that in astrology, and in certain fanciful systems of Bible interpretation, a very foolish and very wicked use has been made of symbolic numbers. I am slow to think that the oldest and one of the best of Greek philosophers had not a glimpse of truth when he spake of "the music of the spheres," and the deep significance of certain numbers. Astrology may deceive the vulgar with strange prognostications from certain combinations

of these numbers ; but the very existence of astrology, and the hold it has and always had on the popular mind, and that not the ignorant only, makes me think that under all this there is some truth, especially so when I see everywhere in nature that certain numbers seem to predominate in different departments. In chemical compounds, with their laws of definite proportions in volume and weight, this is strikingly manifest, and in natural history we see samples of the same thing, though not so striking to the scholar as the former. The number four comprehends the limbs of all the higher order of animals ; ten the number of fingers and of toes ; two the eyes, ears, nostrils, etc. In fact, do not animals, as well as plants, seem to be made in halves, and to be put together ? The wise man said : " God made all things double, and set one over against another ;" and he said truly.

In Scripture the numbers 3, 7, 12, and 40 are ever recurring, nor is it in vain they do so. After examining the various species in the animal economy, and thence proceeding to the flower-leaves of monopetalous and dipetalous plants, both endogenous and exogenous, and finding in these, and in fact all, ever recurring numbers and the multiples of these numbers, I am prepared to find in my Bible the same thing. I do not attach any mysterious meaning to this. I am not superstitious about it ; nor need I be. I say there are in all the works of God typical numbers, typical in its proper sense, and he is a simpleton that denies the same thing in the word of God. If any object to the book called the Revelation of John because these numbers are found on every page, I can object to nature and her works on the same ground. I will not delay to give instances of the typical use of these numbers ; they will readily occur to any one even moderately acquainted with the sacred Scriptures.

But the grandest display of types is to be found in the ordinances of our holy religion, the divine arrangements for bringing us into the enjoyment of the favor of heaven, and into communion with one another. We have explained some of these, particularly those in which, under the law, blood, water, and oil were used ; but let not the reader suppose for a moment that these comprehend all, they are chief, that is all. The brazen serpent, the cities of refuge, the scape-goat, and almost innumerable other things and appointments, are none the less " types of the good things to come" than the many we have mentioned.

As a sample of what may be learned from all these, and as a sample only, we will take a case from one of the epistles, used there to impress on a congregation of disciples a warning, to which we would all do well to take heed. We are not to suppose that the same and other lessons might not be drawn from other passages. This is chosen because it is simple, familiar, and we have clear apostolical authority for our guidance in the interpretation. And we close our discussion

of types with this case, because it also, in connection with the tabernacle, is the subject of our last article, gives us a complete view of the whole matter, embracing both the Christian system and the Christian life. The tabernacle testifies fully the system of Christianity—its laws, ordinances, worship, polity, and its theory; but the journey from Egypt to Canaan of this Israelitish host gives us a fine font of types relating to the Christian life, the trials, dangers and deliverance of God's elect people, now on their way to the true Canaan above.

"One army of the living God,
At his command we bow;
Part of the host have crossed the flood,
And part are crossing now."

"Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual (typical) rock that followed them; and that rock was (a type of) Christ. But with many of them God was not well pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples (types) to the intent we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written: The people sat down to eat and drink (after sacrificing to the idol, as I understand it), and rose up to play. Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents. Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured, and were destroyed of the destroyer. Now all these things happened unto them for types; and they are written for our admonition upon whom the end of the ages has come."

Here we have a graphic picture, and because it suited Paul's purpose in admonishing the Corinthian church to note the things he does in the travels of the Israelites from Egypt to Canaan, we can but suppose that had it suited his purpose he would have chosen the other chief events of that journey also as types of what happens to the Israel of God in passing through this desert life toward their heavenly home.

We find, then, in this history of Israel's deliverance, 1. The land of Egypt. 2. The desert. 3. The land of Canaan. These are items on which we ought first to fix our minds. There is the land of Ham, the cradle of idolatry. The home and birthplace of science, but science in opposition to God's true religion. It is a land of cruelty, where God's chosen ones are in bondage. Over this land Pharaoh rules, and rules with a rod of iron. Task-masters grind to the earth the slaves of the king, and make their life a burden, by reason of bitter bondage.

The moment a redeemer comes to break their yoke, the iron bands of their servitude are drawn tighter upon their already lacerated limbs, their sighs and sobs and loud wailings are heard in heaven. They believe Moses, and turn away from all their love of Egypt. The record shows that it cost them an effort to break away, and it is what we might expect. This Egypt, what an instructive type in the world of sin, with its idolatries, prostituted science, its oppression, and its tyranny ! And how the ruler of this Egypt, hardly letting go of his slaves, answers to Satan himself, who requires his dupes to make brick without straw ! Does not the sinner now need to receive by faith the Christ who comes to deliver him from the Egypt of sin, just as much as the Israelite did his deliverer, Moses ? And is it not with many a straggle here, as there, that the sinner turns his back on the world, in which he has eaten only leeks and onions ; and on the Devil, that never yet let one escape his slavery but by the uplifted hand and outstretched arm of God ?

When Israel believed Moses and turned their backs upon Egypt, they came to the Red Sea, where, according to 1 Cor. x., 1, they were baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea. They followed the mysterious cloud, symbol of the divine presence, and it led them to the sea. They were not clean gone from the grasp of the tyrant until being baptized they triumphed over their enemies, and sung on the shore of deliverance their victorious song : "The Lord has triumphed gloriously ; the horse and his rider he has thrown into the sea." Their deliverance was now complete, and they were prepared to take up their line of march for the promised land. So when we have believed in our Deliverer and turned our back on a world of sin, following the symbol of God's presence, his word, we, too, come to the Red Sea of our baptism. They were baptized into their Redeemer, we are baptized into ours ; they were freed from Egypt in their baptism, we are freed from sin in ours. They began their march to Canaan, we move forward toward our home in heaven. This brings us to the second idea in this typical march. Israel were delivered from their great enemy, Pharaoh, at the sea, but they had a long and wearisome way before them ; they had to journey many a long league and suffer many years before they were to be gladdened with a sight of "Canaan's happy land." In these trials and troubles they often fell, often murmured, and were often chastised. But God did not forsake them ; he gave them bread from heaven, as it is written : He gave them angels' food. He supplied them with water from the smitten rock :

" When Moses gave the stroke,
From Horeb's flinty side
Issued a river, and the rock
The Hebrews' thirst supplied."

That rock, says Paul, in his bold, symbolical style, was Christ. Christ is the smitten rock from whom flow rivers of grace, by which alone we can find refreshment in our desert wanderings. Moses gave you not that true (antitypical) bread, says our Savior to the Jews ; and he teaches them that it is only those who eat his flesh and drink his blood that have eternal life. We depend on God for daily sustenance while marching here below, as much as Israel did for the manna from heaven and the refreshing water from the smitten rock.

But they met enemies on the road. Amalek came down and fought against the people of God ; and it was only through the intercession of Moses that Israel was strengthened to withstand the onset and finally prevail. We defeat our spiritual foes that oppose our progress to heaven in the same way. Through the intercession of Christ, while we are fighting our way along, our enemies are overcome ; and as God then swore to blot out the name of Amalek from under heaven, and did accomplish it in the days of Saul, so our enemies shall be destroyed, but not till we, as they, are settled in Canaan.

Canaan, sweet Canaan, their happy home ; it came to view after long and weary years. Israel, faint yet trusting in God, encamp on the banks of the rolling Jordan ; its turbid waters affright them. God says : "Go forward !" and the ark of the covenant advances, borne by white-robed priests, and followed by believing, trusting multitudes. They emerge from the bed of the river, and lo ! the sweet fields arrayed in green are before them ; they are, after a long journey, many trials, and much toil, in Canaan, the land promised to their fathers. Thus, also, the true Israel of God will at last cross the Jordan of death, and rest in Emanuel's land, the object of many anxious solitudes during their pilgrimage through this desert life. The promises of God will all have been fulfilled, his faithfulness proved, and the wonders of his grace and mercy be the theme of his saved ones forever and ever.

We are now at the end of the journey we proposed to make with our readers a few months ago. There are many, very many beauties we have not examined. The testimonies of God are open to all, and we may, as opportunity and inclination move us, consult the Pentateuch, and the Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews, particularly the last ; and we shall find a typical system revealed in the word of God from which we may learn the most interesting of all lessons in religion. If by these few articles any soul has been led to form a better opinion of the Scriptures, or, though faint and weary in the wilderness, to put forth another effort to reach the land of rest ; or if the reader has had half the pleasure in reading these which the writer has had in writing them, the time occupied has not been spent in vain.

We bid the reader adieu ! for though called to separate for a short season on the road, we hope to meet him when life and its labors are over in the heavenly Jerusalem, whither the tribes have gone up, in that temple where our great High-Priest shall offer before God the grateful incense of our worship, in a congregation that shall never break up, and on the Sabbath day that shall never end.

SELFISHNESS.—How mean, how sinful is selfishness ! It sets at defiance the authority of God, and mocks him when he repeats his commands. It studies to frustrate all his benevolent intentions, which come in competition with its own ambition. It raises an arm of extermination against all virtue and goodness which throw any obstacle in its way, and even threatens to demolish the whole spiritual workmanship of God, that it may have no competitors for empire on earth.

Selfishness is at war with all righteousness ; it gnashes its teeth at every voice of kindness that rebukes it, and revels amidst the spoils it has torn from the virtues of others. It is the parent of all the disorders that afflict the race of man. Whence the lying, the frauds, the cheating, the slanders, the hatreds, the impurities, the quarrels, the wars, the bloodsheds, the murders, and the ten thousand agents of wrath and misery ; do they not all spring from this foul spirit that sits with satanic sovereignty over the heart of man ? What havoc has this spirit made of all that is lovely and holy in its character ! Had not God in his infinite wisdom set bounds to its ravages, it long since would have finished its work of ruin on earth, and every human soul would have been a companion of those who choose to rule in hell, rather than serve in heaven. Selfishness is a principle of depraved desire, appetite, and passion. It stifles the voice of conscience and the law of God ; and, being an intelligent moral nature, it justly exposes every soul under its dominion to utter condemnation and wrath of God.

Reader, can you appeal to the great Searcher of hearts, and say : "Lord, thou knowest that I love thee more than silver and gold, more than honors or pleasures, more than houses or lands, more than father or mother. Thou knowest that I am thine, and that for thee I live, and for thee I shall die ?" Blessed is the life, and blessed will be the death of that man, that woman, that youth, and that child who can thus appeal.

R. T.

LARD'S QUARTERLY.

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER, 1867.

No. 4.

OUR PRESENT POSITION AND FUTURE DUTIES.

EVERY judicious merchant deems it necessary at least once a year to take an account of the state of his business. The sum of his indebtedness is carefully ascertained ; his stock in trade minutely invoiced ; his outstanding accounts assorted, and the amount which they will probably yield accurately computed. No merchant is deemed safe, no matter how prosperous he may seem to be, who neglects these prudential steps ; nor is any deemed very unsafe who does not. They are steps alike due himself, and due those to whom he is often heavily obliged. They are due himself, that he may know how to conduct his business, whether to expand or contract, whether to force his chattles into sale or stiffly hold them in store for better prices,—due himself, that he may not pass his life in uncertainty, that his calling may be to him a source of pleasure, and not a life-long annoyance ; they are due others, that they may sustain no losses through his negligence, and that confidence, that great inter-commercial necessity, may be preserved steady and firm. In a word, it is both unwise and criminal to omit these steps.

Nor is less, though the kind be different, expected of the farmer. He must see to it that his fences are kept in good repair, that his labor may not be destroyed by trespasses of breachy stock ; his barns, moreover, must be sufficiently capacious to preserve well the results of his toil ; nor must anything be allowed to go to loss when once brought to maturity ; his dwelling must be reroofed in due time, gutters repaired, and all other causes of decay and ruin be at once checked. Stock must be carefully tended when young, and kindly and economically housed when driving storms or nights below zero may demand. Nothing which his farm can produce, from his splendid roadster to the minnow in his pond, must be deemed unworthy of his care. Then only may he expect to be prosperous and happy.

If now in these mere temporalities a constant necessity exists to take account and be on the watch, how much more in the infinitely weightier matters of Christianity ! Can even the semblance of neg-

lect be held to be innocent here? As far as the food of the spirit transcends the food of the body, or the brightness of the soul's vestment, when it shall stand in the presence of God, will exceed the lustre of the coat I to-day wear, so far does the necessity in this case rise above the necessity in that. By the highest considerations, then, which can either determine the motives or control the actions of men, I entreat my brethren in Christ to come and sit down with me while, in the fear of God, we attempt to take an account of ourselves, our work, and the things which threaten and the things which favor at the present conjuncture.

Near half a century is now passed since, as a people, we came before the world with our plea for a reformation. By many that plea was not then understood, by many it is not now understood. Let us pause on it a little. As it looked to two classes of the human family, so it had two objects in view. These objects were constantly kept distinct, and defined with all necessary severity. To the saint first the plea looked, next to the sinner. I speak of it first in its relations to the saint.

The church of God is the sum of all Christians ; and he only is a member thereof who is a Christian. Whatever else a man may be, if not a Christian he is no member of the church ; and whatever else he may be, if a Christian he is a member of it. By a Christian I mean simply one whose sins, through obedience to Christ, are forgiven. For whatever else a man may be, if not thus forgiven he is no Christian ; and whatever else he may be, if thus forgiven he is a Christian. Hence the church of God is not an aggregation of churches ; far less is it an aggregation of denominations. Indeed denominations, as such, make no part of the church. They are a crime and an insult to Jesus Christ. They are, hence, not integral parts of his body. They are the offspring of the man of sin, and not creations of the Author of Christianity. They are to be lamented in tears which burn the cheek to blisters as they run. Moreover, the church of God is not an organization, except in a qualified sense of the term. Metaphorically it is called a body. In this view Christ is its head, while each individual saint is a member in it. This may imply organization, but not organization in the sense in which we apply the term to those great combinations of men we call governments, or even those less assemblages we call societies. The church of God is an aggregation, not an organization. It is composed of the whole of those who are Christians. Annihilate these, and the church is extinct ; but as long as they are, it is. Hence, since the founding of Christianity to the present moment, the church has continuously been in being ; for the simple reason, that all along from that time to this there have been Christians. According to the pledge of Christ, the gates of the Unseen were never to prevail against his church. Hence from the moment of its crea-

tion to the present it has never ceased to be. True, as already said, it has existed only in the individual Christians who have composed it ; but it has existed not the less on this account.

Now, although the church of God is thus composed of the aggregate of all individual Christians, individuals, too, collected out of the various nationalities and tongues of earth, and hence differing in speech, color, and domestic habits, still it is provided that it shall be characterized by the most faultless unity. *It is to be of one book, one mind, one faith, one speech, one practice.* Above this, unity among men can not rise. But on each of these items I must speak in detail.

1. *Of the one book.* This must be the Bible. With it unity must begin, and without it as one we can have no unity. For if the church have more, then by so many as the number exceeds unity will we multiply the chances of division. If it have even one more, it has one too many. In this case, since one is divine, the other must be human ; and on the human we can never agree. No human book can ever be perfect in its doctrines. To so affirm would be to exalt human reason to an equality with the divine ; for in divine reason alone can perfect doctrine originate. With a book of imperfect doctrine the soul of man can never be satisfied. It sighs only for perfection here, and this mere human reason can never guarantee. In doctrine lies the safety of the soul. Doctrine is its light, the law of its thought, the law of its action. It hence must be perfect. This no human book can be. It hence can never meet this first great want of the soul.

But how, it will be said, do I know even the New Testament to be perfect? I answer, in and of myself I do not know it at all. In man exists no standard of perfection ; hence thus I can not know it. The point is inferential. From its source I conclude it to be perfect. No imperfect thing can emanate from Christ ; but from him comes the New Testament ; hence the inference that it is perfect. Reverse the reasoning, and with equal force it applies to all human books. No perfect book of doctrines, touching the mystery of spirits, the nature of the future, and the destiny of man, can ever originate in human reason. The source itself is unequal to the task ; and like source, like book, is a stern truth.

But on coming before the Christian world with our plea, did we find it even so far one as to have but one book? Very far from it. Here we were met, in the very outset, by many parties, each party having two books—the one divine, the other human. Brethren, we said to these parties, but only in so far as they were strictly Christian, lay aside your human books, and let us have only the Bible. If your human books contain anything true, they have derived it from the Bible ; if they contain anything else good, it has the same source. The Bible, we continued, contains all the truth your creeds contain

and much more. Your creeds, therefore, do not contain enough. Besides, many other things are found in the Bible which are not found in your creeds. Your creeds are hence defective. On creeds, then, we argued, scanty and defective as they are, we can never be one. On these grounds we urged their utter abandonment. We are not yet recovered from the amazement occasioned by the rejection of this plea by many.

The reply to our plea for one book was a curious reply, and deserves to be here repeated. All parties, we were told, take the Bible ; the Mormons take it ; the Universalists take it ; we can not tell what a man's faith is who simply takes the Bible. First : all parties take the Bible. Suppose they do ; what then ? Because all parties take it, and some parties abuse it, shall Christians therefore reject it ? If this be not the force of the position, it has none. Call it not reason ; call it folly. But Mormons and Universalists take the Bible. Be it so ; I for one am glad ; for in the Bible is my only hope that their crimes and errors will ever be corrected. He who has the Bible, and is wrong, may get right ; he who has not the Bible, and is wrong, never will. Second : but we can not tell what a man's faith is who takes only the Bible. Did lips that fear God ever utter this ? Surely not. No ; his faith is indeterminate who takes only the Bible ! The reason is obvious. The Bible itself is a muddy book. God can not write clearly. All is dark where he speaks. But only let man write a book—a creed. All will be clear then. We can know what his faith is who takes the human book ; we can not know what his is who takes the divine. The human book, then, must be better than the divine. Would it, then, not be best to throw the divine away ? Or may not this be the real truth in the case : that he who takes only the Bible has no faith. Is he not an infidel ? I much incline to think it. At least, what his faith is, if he have any, can not be known. Better, then, it seems to me, deny outright that he has any. This would simplify the issue. Of one thing I feel sure, that, in this day, orthodoxy is the doxy of the creed ; heresy the doxy of the Bible ; faith in the traditions of that is true faith ; faith in the teachings of this is false faith. The judgment day will decide.

2. *Of one mind.* On this point, omitting an intervening clause for brevity, Paul thus speaks : "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind.*" If now any weight is to be allowed to one of the most solemn entreaties which it is in the power of human speech to utter, then must Christians be perfectly one in mind. If exceptions exist, they must be held to be intensely criminal. Unity here is an imperious necessity. It is radical and relative, and can not be dispensed with—radical, because it is the basis of union in other items ; relative, because it determines other unions. Did our plea find Chris-

tians one in this respect? It would be difficult to imagine a state of things more completely the opposite. In knowledge, in sentiment, and feeling, the children of God are estranged one from another. Not only were they not one in mind, but all fraternal affection seemed to have perished in their hearts. We mourned over this state of things, and profoundly desired a change. To this end we then wrought; to this end we are still working, with too little success I am only ashamed to add.

3. *Of one faith.* The word faith, both in the New Testament and in the current speech of the day, has two different meanings. Chiefly and primarily it denotes simply the act of believing; but it also denotes the things believed. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God—here the word denotes simply *the act* of believing. But when I say, Christ arose from the dead—this is my faith; clearly it denotes *what* I believe. Now in our effort to give our plea success, we encountered our main difficulty in the first or primary sense of the word. We found it impossible to get all, even of those whom we recognized as Christians, to accept the term in this sense. They insisted that it denoted some occult thing imparted to the soul in some inscrutable way by the Holy Spirit. That it denoted simply the mental conviction that everything said in the Bible is true, men seemed determined not to allow. Still, our duty was clear. All we could do was to present the truth. If men rejected it, the deed was theirs. We were free. What our duty was then in that case, our duty is to-day in every case. We must present the whole truth, no more, not less. The rest remains with the world.

4. *Of one speech.* "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, *that you all speak the same thing,*" is apostolic, earnest, and inconceivably important. Diversity of speech implies difference in faith, and this is not allowable. Unity among the children of God is the sublimest necessity that can exist. This must pervade the thoughts of the inner man, and be embodied in the acts of the outer. It alone guarantees success. Division among the saints is victory for Satan. Nor can this unity be partial; it must be complete; neither can it be insisted on in regard to a few things presumptuously called essential, and disregarded as to others criminally deemed non-essential. It must be insisted on in everything, from the great proposition that Jesus is the Christ, down even to the proper lettering of a word. The harmony among the children of God must be a universal harmony; no dissent of mind from mind; no collision of thought with thought, nor the semblance of discord in speech. Only then can the whole power of the church and of the gospel be spent on the world for good. But this consummation we shall never see while in the flesh. The hope of unity among God's people is gone from earth. I insist on it because in itself right, but I expect it not. I am defending a divine theory; not forecasting a coming fact.

5. *Of one practice.* By this I mean that both the practice of churches and the practice of individuals must be one ; that is, that church must agree with church in practice, as must individual with individual. And so complete should this agreement be, that were you to photograph the conduct of one church, it would be the exact likeness of all others, and so of individuals. Only in matters purely discretionary is diversity admissible ; and even here let the difference be slight and immaterial, since no necessity can exist for the contrary. The great rule in discretionary matters is, that our conduct, both in itself and in its tendency, shall be in strict accordance with the spirit and tenor of the gospel. It is not enough that inconsistency be shunned ; positive consistency must be maintained. And the rule of discretion should be acted upon with extreme caution. It must not be pleaded too far. If a doubt exist, let us resolutely stop on the safe side of the doubt. This side will generally be the side of non-action.

The foregoing are some of the items, discussed in general terms only, in which the children of God, though differing nationally and lingually, must yet strictly agree. And where this agreement does not exist, the difference is marked by crime as sure as the decisions of the Bible are final. But on announcing our plea we found not this agreement to exist. Our duty, therefore, was clear. It was to demand of the followers of Christ, in his name, that instantly, without conference or debate, they should abandon everything they held, whether it was an article of faith or an item of practice, for which they could not produce indisputable warrant of Holy Writ, or which could not be shown, being discretionary, to be consistent therewith. This demand made fearful work of the party tenets of the day. Traditions trooped away into desert places, muttering as they went, like exorcised demons. Practices fell suddenly into disuse, for which the prescription of ages could be pleaded. Bigots growled and the clergy raged. Still duty urged us unremittingly on. We were right, and therefore could not desist.

To these children of God, therefore, our plea had this extent, no more : that they should abandon only the errors they held, but strictly retain the truth. The Bible, and that only, was then laid down as the test by which error was to be tried, and the fountain from which truth was to be drawn. To this everything was to be brought. Whatever could not stand this test was to be discarded, though it were the dearest conviction of the heart ; whatever could, was to be held at no matter what cost. It was only on condition of the abandonment of these errors, whether found in faith or practice, that we ever proposed either to unite, or unite with, these children. When once a clean riddance had been made of everything unsanctioned by the Bible, then it was that our plea for union was urged. We never

dreamed of union before, or on other grounds. But in uniting these children, we did not propose the formation of a sect or party. A Christian simply is not a sectarian, neither a partisan. Hence a combination of these can in no legitimate sense be called a sect. Viewing the church of God as a building, we gladly accepted the foundation laid down by Paul, which is Jesus Christ. On this alone we proposed to build. As now we wrought with no material but Christians, we hence founded not a sect, but built only the church of God. This alone as to Christians was then our work ; this it is still.

Hence we made no proposition then, neither do we now, to Christians to abandon all their faith, and accept, as is sometimes represented, a new thing. We proposed rather that they should abandon only all the Bible does not teach, but accept all it does. We felt that all *Christians*, though found among sects, must necessarily have much truth. This truth we proposed to hold in common with them, not to abandon it.

But we never proposed to unite with sectarians as such. To these we proposed that they should be or become simply Christians, and then as living stones be built into the church. More than this we never proposed ; more than this we do not now desire.

But to the world our plea was a very different thing. Here our proposition was purely the proposition of the gospel—that men should become simply Christians, no more, no less. No partial changes were here proposed ; complete ones alone were demanded. We spoke not now with men partly right and partly wrong. We spoke only to those wholly wrong. Hence the change required had to be original, absolute, and complete. We worked now for a new creature, wholly new.

To the world we laid it down, backed high above doubt by Holy Writ, that three things are necessary to becoming a Christian, to wit : belief, repentance, and immersion. We affirmed, with profound conviction of its truth, that he who does these things is saved. We flushed no hope in any man's bosom who neglects them. Thus, while we resolutely stood for the truth on the one hand, we shrank not from being plain on the other. We felt solemnly bound to declare the whole ; tremblingly we left the rest with the world.

We were concerned then, as still, with two great questions, one the question of the sinner, the other the question of the saint ; that, What shall I do to be saved ? this, How shall I live the Christian life ? In answering these questions, we allowed nothing to philosophy, nothing to reason, nothing to tradition. Everything was placed on the basis of authority. Hence we ignored the metaphysics of Calvin on the one hand, and shunned the shallow discussions of free will on the other. We looked on these opposing issues as the fruitful sources of a huge bundle of traditions having no other effect

than to render null the word of God. These traditions were the gospel of the day. They were the standard by which everything was tried. Even the decisions of the Bible bowed before them, and were either explained wholly away or made to harmonize with them. He only was enrolled as a saint who gave heart room to these traditions, while he was written down as worse than a heathen who did not. They domineered over the popular mind, and held it in a bondage fearful to think of. We saw that, unless the spell in which these traditions held the world could be broken, the case of the world was hopeless. Against this spell but one recourse was left to us. There still lingered in the hearts of many a conventional, if not a real, respect for the Bible. Our first duty was to exalt and strengthen this respect. This was no easy task; for men heard with languid ears your plea for the Bible and that alone, while their souls were yet drowsy from the effect of tradition. Still, as we had but the one alternative left, our duty was to exhaust that.

Here, moreover, we encountered another difficulty of no small magnitude. We found it not an easy task in these matters to set limits to and define the province of human reason. Religion was in large part the invention of men. Here, therefore, reason played its part. It suggested and shaped religion. Its authority was hence high. To remedy this required discretion and skill. Our first duty was to make clear that the divine stands above the human, and that Christianity originated in the divine. This done, all else was easy. Now the province of reason could be laid down. It was to determine what God had said, not to invent; to sit and try the question, What is here? not to suggest. Changes now went rapidly on. The Bible took the place of reason; while tradition, as the matter and law of faith, gave place to the teachings of Christ. So far the victory was complete. Still difficulties were not at an end. In details much was met with to discourage and test our patience. But of these secondary matters I can not here speak.

But where do we now stand, or what is the sum of our achievements? Nothing, I think, can be clearer than that the following positions have been eliminated and shown to rest on an immovable basis:

1. That the Bible alone teaches a religion fully adequate to the salvation of the whole human family.

2. That all human creeds are deductions of unaided human reason, and in essence are simply bundles of traditions, and consequently tend only to make void the truth.

3. That the terms of the Bible, like the terms of any other ancient book, are to be taken in their simple natural sense; and that they are not terms bearing a mystic double meaning.

4. That Christianity is so perfectly adapted to man, that just as he is, with no extrinsic aid, he can fully understand it and acceptably obey it.

5. That the popular notion that the Holy Spirit operates directly on the human mind in conversion, and in order to it, is a delusion, and condemned by the history of the primitive conversions.

6. That faith and belief are identical ; that faith is the simple conviction that what the Bible says is true ; and that the notion of various kinds of faith is false.

7. That repentance is the simple determination of an individual himself to abandon sin, followed by the act.

8. That faith, repentance, and immersion are necessary to the remission of sins, and that remission is guaranteed on no other conditions.

9. That in the case of the believing penitent, the only thing precedent to immersion is the simple confession, with the mouth, of faith in Christ Jesus.

10. That the Holy Spirit is promised only to the forgiven, and that it dwells in all such.

11. That Christians should meet on every first day of the week, to break the loaf and drink of the cup, and thus show forth Christ's death till he comes again.

12. That each individual church is in and of itself, and in its own right, independent of all other churches ; that it can in no case be dictated to, nor interfered with in its acts ; and that it is responsible alone to Christ.

13. That the authority inherent in the individual church is the highest ecclesiastic authority known in the kingdom of God ; and that consequently neither churches nor individuals can combine to form a body or organization having any power to determine articles of faith, enact rules of practice, or decide questions of discipline.

14. That all questions of faith and conduct must be tried at once by the Bible ; and that matters of opinion are to be made neither tests of piety nor tests of fellowship.

15. That the individual church in its public worship is to be strictly governed by prescription of Holy Writ, or apostolic precedent, and that all acts and things not thus sanctioned are innovations and criminal.

16. That individual Christians may, in their discretion, form voluntary associations, such as colleges, Sunday schools, and missionary societies, provided nothing therein is allowed, inconsistent with the teachings of Holy Writ.

Perhaps a few items might be added to this schedule, but these will be at once recognized by all the true men in our ranks as the great fundamental principles which underlie our effort to restore primitive Christianity to the world. Of course, they are not presented as a complete statement of our faith, nor as a detailed account of our practice, but as a concise summary of what, as a people, we have

achieved, or of the things which distinguish us. No man among us is deemed sound who repudiates even one of these items, while none is held as unsound who accepts them. They are the tenets which have given us the victory hitherto, and in the severe maintenance of which alone we have the guarantee of the victory for the future. Rebate these principles, and we are merged in the parties of the day ; rebate one of them, and to that extent we wreck the best hopes of earth. We can never abandon them, nor allow them to be materially modified without proving recreant to the high trust to which God in his providence has called us ; and the day we begin to relax in their defense is the day in which he will begin to repudiate us, and in which he will prepare to raise up a people true to that to which we prove false. In kindness may it be granted to us that that day may never come.

From all the premises now before us our present duty becomes clear. It is to maintain inviolate the great principles through which our past successes have been achieved ; and to push on our work, as far as in us lies, to a still higher state of perfection. We can not hope that even our theory of Christianity is yet as full and as exact as it should be ; and as for our practice, it certainly falls far below the divine standard. Much, it may be, yet remains to be done in the way of ascertaining and defining the precise powers and functions of evangelists, the powers and duties of overseers, with those of deacons. Unless I am much in error, no small confusion still hangs over the public mind touching these items. They need to be thoroughly reconsidered from their most elemental conception up. Besides, we have yet to induce a deeper tone of piety in our membership, and a liberality in giving of which we have had no examples up to the present time. The whole flock must be required to meet on every Lord's day, and not a delinquency be permitted. Each member must be taught, male and female, old and young, to pray in public whenever called upon. In a word, every member must be taught that Christ has something for him to do ; that he is to be a living stone in the great spiritual house, contributing to its growth, and helping it to fulfill its mission. Not an idler must be allowed. Never till the whole available strength of the church is thus put forth, till its whole spiritual power is spent on the world, shall we be able to appreciate the wisdom of Christ in creating it. At present its power for good is feeble in comparison with what it might be. In my candid judgment, our churches have yet a lesson to learn of which but few even of our preachers have a true conception. But of this I can not here speak.

What, I now inquire, is likely to be our success in maintaining for time to come the footing we have now gained. Have we the prospect of complete success ? I wish I had an affirmative answer to these questions ; and yet, perhaps, we have no right to expect for

Christianity a success in our hands which did not attend it in the hands of the apostles. While Paul was yet alive the mystery of iniquity began to work, and a falling away was foreseen. The fortunes of the ancient church will be repeated in our hands. A falling away will occur, and the iniquity which will induce it is at this moment at work. The sturdy love for the primitive faith which characterized the early preachers in the reformation is cooling in men who still linger in our ranks and call us brethren. They are yet with us, but they are not of us. Their name is not legion ; still they are numerous enough to do no little mischief if allowed to remain. These men are known and watched ; and while the wish is to save them, save them for their own sakes and for the sake of the cause, still the belief is deepening that it will not be done. They may be easily known.

In the first place, they are intensely sentimental ; rather, they are intensely transcendental. They are very clerical in bearing, soft in speech, and languid and effeminate in spirit. They are poets and ladies' men, exquisites in parlors, and never condemn anything except their brethren. These men are of the opinion that it is a very vulgar thing for preachers to be tried by their respective churches, or to be in any sense amenable to them. They want a pompous clerical organization, to which alone they shall stand or fall. They must be "tried by their peers." To creeds they have not the slightest objection ; only they do not want the brotherhood generally to know the fact. It is not yet sufficiently popular. These are very dignified men ; and pope and prelate express no offensive conceptions to them. Indeed, themselves would wear titles with rare grace. They are "beautiful" men, and preach "beautiful" sermons. Their prayers are "beautiful" things, their songs "beautiful" songs. Moreover, they are very abstract men, and the æsthetic, the moral, the true, the beautiful, and the good are very fond phrases in their bloodless and virtuous lips.

In the second place, they have an enormous fondness for sects and sectarians ; and scowl on no one so indignantly as on the brother who dares to speak against them. With them sectarians are all Christians ; and it is a favorite saying among them that "we are as sectarian as any other people." They seldom speak of their brethren except to disparage them ; and never of "the other" parties of the day except to laud them. In plain English, these men see nothing good in the great brotherhood to whom they are an offense, nor anything bad in the sects with whom their affinities really are. It would be difficult to account for the fact that they continue with us were it not that he who has perverted them has a deep interest to annoy us in every way in his power. If they are not to be saved, then our prayer is that the Lord will see to it that their connection with us shall be dissolved immediately. Toward them I can have no feeling

but one of regret. Still, regarding them as I do, as the secret enemies of Christianity, I can not desire their prosperity. Of their reformation I have no hope. The opposition to their course may become such as to break them down ; but in that case they will turn moody grumblers. They will never more work with us kindly.

Another circumstance, very significant to my mind, marks the career of these men. With hardly an exception they indorse and admire *Ecce Homo*. And it must be confessed that no book has appeared within the last twenty-five years which embodies so much of their faith or expresses it so well as that book. The man who indorses *Ecce Homo* is the enemy of Jesus Christ and of the cause he died to establish. With me nothing is more certain than this. If these men understand the book, and still approve it, they should at once abandon the church of Christ. Or if they see not that it is a dangerous book, they are given up to blindness, because the love of the truth is not in them.

In the third place, there is a peculiar dialect which characterizes these men. "The reformation is a failure," is one of their favorite sayings. Not quite true, gentlemen. You are the failure ; it is not the cause we plead. Again, and especially, "I do not believe that baptism is for the remission of sins." This is said with weighty emphasis. Why, then, do you still continue to fraternize with a people who do believe it? Your departure will give us pleasure, not pain. "We must quit opposing the sects ; they are as good as we are." This is another of the pet expressions which ripen in the lips of these men. But we shall not abandon our opposition so long as the Bible remains the law of our action. On this you may count with confidence. Further : "We must quit preaching our distinctive doctrines ;" and again, "our religion lacks style." But on these items I shall detain the reader no longer. A few samples are deemed sufficient.

To the brethren everywhere I say, see to it that your preachers are kept to the Book. Allow no departure from it ; and all will end well.

That one now and then from among those whom we love for the Master's sake will fall away is something to be looked for. All will not remain true. This should rather teach us to fear, than to move us. The same great foe who seduces them also seeks us. Let us not boast ourselves too confidently against him. It is the end of a man's life which determines his safety, not its commencement. No man knows to what extent Satan can influence him. Let him, then, since herein alone lies his safety, stick close to Christ, close to the truth, close to holiness, and all must end well. A failure in any one of these items is the forfeiture of heaven. We can not afford to take the risk of missing it.

ON INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC IN CHURCHES OF CHRIST.

DR. H. CHRISTOPHER.

"Contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."—JUDE.

THERE is one prominent feature, one especially distinctive and striking peculiarity, in the religion of Jesus Christ, which is its excellence and glory. In the eyes of philosophy this may be its defect and shame. This peculiarity or distinctive feature is its stereotyped character. The gospel of Jesus Christ is a stereotyped religion. It was completed by the Holy Spirit speaking and writing by the inspired apostles, and during their lifetime. Since their death no man has spoken by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. As the inspired men left the gospel, so the Holy Spirit left it, and so it must ever remain until God shall change, alter, or modify it. It is the same to-day that it was in the days of the apostles; and it is but the dictate of common sense that man can not retouch it, embellish or modify it in the least important particular. The apostle Jude affirms as much. He exhorts that we "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." The words "once delivered" point to a certain and particular time when this faith was delivered to the saints. This time was the apostolic age. By "the faith" he means the gospel of Jesus Christ, called also by him "the common salvation." By the saints, he must mean the Christians of the early years of the apostolic age. So that, as regards the application of this command to us of the present day, we must understand the apostle as exhorting us to contend for the gospel as it was left by the apostles in the New Testament Scriptures. The exhortation of the apostle, equivalent with us to a command, confines us to the words of the inspired apostles, and binds us down to the apostolic age. As a people, we so understand the words of Jude. We look only to the writings of the apostles of Jesus Christ, and repudiate all human authority or interference in matters that pertain to our religious faith and practice. The Bible is our only authority, and we reject everything that concerns our faith and practice not sanctioned by the apostles. We stand firmly and immovably on this ground. It is our glory or our shame, our strength or our weakness. We stand or fall here. We believe and maintain that the religion of Jesus Christ was finished, completed, and stereotyped by the apostles, and in their day. We believe that the Christian Scriptures contain all that God has seen proper to reveal, and all that man's con-

dition under sin in every age of the world needs or requires. We do not believe that God has, since the death of the last inspired man, uttered one word, or that he ever will utter another, in addition to what he spoke by the inspired men of the New Testament. We are not ashamed to acknowledge the supreme authority of the apostles of Jesus Christ, and to bind our consciences by their word. We recognize them as possessing vital and supreme authority, and deny that their word is susceptible of either addition, improvement, or abridgment on the part of men.

This position necessarily compels us to reject all human interference or authority in matters pertaining to our religious faith and practice. We have placed ourselves among the apostles, and fear to come one century this side of their day, lest we also be overtaken and finally overwhelmed by corruptions, which men began so early to introduce into the apostolic faith and practice. So soon as the inspired men had passed away, "the iniquity" which began to work in the days of the apostles was not long in developing itself. When the restraint of the presence of the apostles was removed, it felt that its time had come, and began to exhibit those principles and characteristics which appear so conspicuous in the papacy. The sources of the innovations and corruptions, which eventually deluged the church and obscured the faith and practice of the apostolic church, were the various systems of pagan philosophy, Jewish tradition and the Jewish religion, in which men supposed they saw more beautiful and rational expositions of the Christian philosophy, and more powerful, appropriate, and attractive means of recommending the gospel to an ungodly world, and of smoothing and softening its offensive plainness and simplicity.

Innovations and corruptions have been introduced into the church at such an early day in its history, it is not safe to stop this side of the days of its purity in determining what God requires of us. For this reason we have determined to get behind all corruptions and innovations by ascending the stream to its fountain, and placing ourselves among the apostles and in the apostolic church. Standing here, we say to the world that we know nothing but what we find in the writings of the apostles and in the practice of the primitive or apostolic church. We pronounce these all-sufficient for every purpose relating to our religious faith and practice. The revelation of God contains all that we need or require to know of our relations, duties, and responsibilities to God and to the great Head of the church. We confine ourselves to the narrow limits of the apostolic writings and to the practice of the apostolic church, believing it to be our only safety against similar or other corruptions which bring defilement and ruin on the church.

If this step is to be considered shameful and degrading, as ignoring

or disregarding that spirit of progress which has done so much, and which will yet do much, for the advancement and improvement of the race in all the human elements and instrumentalities of civilization, we can not help it. We know it is not. We know that it is not only honorable and ennobling, but imperiously necessary. And more than this, that it is demanded of us by God, leaving us no discretion, because he allows no interference on the part of either angels or men in anything that he has commanded or ordained.* We believe the step to have been wise and judicious, and our only protection against an influx of errors, and we do not intend to recede from it. We must not allow ourselves to be disturbed in our convictions, or led into dangerous paths by this deceptive plea of progress. It has already done a vast amount of mischief. It has destroyed the religion of many a man, and we must be on our guard lest it destroy us. We must make necessary and proper discriminations. We must remember that progress is a word not applicable to the religion of Jesus Christ. It was stereotyped by the Holy Spirit in the persons of the apostles, and is not, consequently, susceptible of progress. How irrational and foolish, then, to apply words to the revelation of God which can be properly applied only to human art, science, or politics.

Had men been content with the ordinances of God, and the provisions which he instituted for the advancement and preservation of his cause on the earth, the great apostasy would never have occurred to disgrace the religion of Jesus Christ. And had the Protestants of the sixteenth century taken our ground and adopted our principles of going back to the apostles, and contending for nothing but the faith and practice of the apostolic church, the church would have been spared its present unhappy division, the one great cause of modern infidelity. Hence, if we would preserve the unity of the church, and keep out corruptions and innovations of every kind, we must confine ourselves to the teachings of the apostles, and to the practice of the apostolic church. We are driven to this position and confined to it by the highest considerations for the interests of the church and the most inexorable logic.

This step is the distinctive feature of our reformatory movement, our power and glory, and our only hope of success; the only means and way by which the world can be converted to Christ, and the church preserved from corruptions with which human ambition and pride have flooded it in days gone by. It was a grand and mighty conception, a sweeping generalization, that carried us, at one bound, over the heads of eighteen centuries, and placed us behind all the corruptions and causes of divisions which now defile and distract the church. It evinces a grasp of mind at once grand and wonderful. It

* 1 Gal. i., 8, 9. .

develops a logic that strikes at the root of all error and corruption ; that undermines their foundation ; and cuts down at one blow the great apostasy and all its fruit. This work alone is sufficient to immortalize the name of Alexander Campbell, and assure his fame to the latest generation. Had he done no more than give existence to this logic, and to set on foot this movement, the world would still have been greatly blessed by his life ; for it is a step whose logic sweeps from the church all error and corruption, all human interference with its faith and practice ; and carries us back once and forever to the apostles, and there confines us. The ax which the Baptist laid at "the root of the trees" was not more destructive of the claims and pretensions of the Jews than is this step destructive of the errors and corruptions of the church at the present day. Our movement, therefore, is similar to that of the Harbinger, and consequently sanctioned by the highest authority in the universe and the soundest wisdom. We need not, therefore, be ashamed of this character of our movement. There is no ground between this and spiritualism but Popery, so that we must hold to the apostles, or, cutting loose from them, sail out into the boundless ocean of spiritualism, or fret and fritter away life in the lifeless forms and ceremonies of Romanism.

The position which this procedure gives us before the world, and the principle which underlies it, are no longer with us a subject for doubt or dispute. These are now settled and established. The principle on which we are proceeding is now as fixed, immovable, and unchangeable as an axiom of mathematics. To entertain a doubt of its wisdom and necessity is to let the world go back again to the darkness and confusion of the papacy. To doubt or reject this position and principle is to destroy all that has been done, and leave the religion of Jesus at the mercy of men. To doubt or reject these is to sweep the religion of Jesus from the earth, and leave the world nothing but a mangled, bleeding corpse. To doubt or reject these is to destroy even an apostate church from the earth, and leave scarcely a vestige of the religion of Jesus in the world. Christ and his apostles must reign supreme and dictate to the world, or mankind must be left to the guidance of human reason ; and then revelation, authoritative and final, will be spurned from the earth ; then spiritualism will reign with undisputed sway. He, therefore, who discards the position we now occupy, and rejects the principle on which we are proceeding, which is the life and salvation of the church, gathers not with Christ.

The great leader in the present reformatory movement saw the logic of his proposed step, and though it seemed to annihilate his religious being, yet he did not falter or stagger. He was fully persuaded of its wisdom, necessity, and efficacy, and he took his stand deliberately and resolutely. With one effort, all human creeds and

human dictation in all matters pertaining to man's religious faith and practice were rejected, and the Bible taken up and held up as the only authority worthy of our submission and binding on the conscience.

To give form and body to this principle, and make this step practical, and confine it within proper and necessary limits, it was wisely determined that for all matters demanded of and enjoined on men we should have the sanction and authority of a "Thus saith the Lord." This limitation is necessary to save the principle from a too sweeping application. The principle must apply to and include nothing but those things which relate to our religious faith and practice—to those matters which belong to worship. As to matters which are evidently and confessedly within the limits of and belong to the domain of human reason and wisdom; as to matters which pertain to social, provincial, or national customs and habits, "which perish with the using," these are no more to be included as governed by this principle than are the various forms of civil government. We must, therefore, observe some necessary distinctions and limitations in the application of this great and important principle.

There is another important and necessary distinction to be made, if we would convince the world of the corruptions of the apostasy and preserve ourselves from a similar fate. This distinction has reference to the *source* whence our faith and practice are derived. This source is the New Testament—not the Jewish Institution. The Old Testament may be suggestive and corroborative, but it is not authoritative. It has been superseded by the New, just as the Jewish religion has been superseded by the Christian. The supersession is based on many reasons, an important one of which is the essential difference in their genius and nature. Because a distinction has not been made just here, the church has been oppressed for centuries with Jewish notions and practices. From Judaism the apostate church has derived infant membership; Jewish ceremonies of burning incense, of priestly robes, and its ritual service. Growing up into power and influence under the influx of corruptions and innovations of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, the Roman Catholic Church has many things in its faith and practice of Jewish and Pagan origin. Its ritual service is mostly Jewish, and its worship of saints and images is Pagan, borrowed from the hero worship of Greece and Rome. Protestantism has taken its chief corner-stone—infant membership—from Judaism; and that moral excrescence on our body politic—Mormonism—goes to David and Solomon for its polygamy.

These corruptions, and especially the reasoning which has given them existence, ought to show us the importance, and indeed the imperative necessity, of making legitimate and proper distinctions, and to put us on our guard against false analogies and accidental resemblances.

On our principles the New Testament and the practice of the apostolic church can be our only guides and authorities on all subjects that concern our religious faith and practice. Where the Scriptures are only didactic and allusory, the principle may be applied and the allusion verified and made clear, by a reference to the practice of the apostolic church, as this is gathered from the Scriptures and contemporary history. In this way many disputed points may be settled, and many corruptions and innovations exposed. There was, for instance, no worship of saints or of images in the apostolic church, nor any ritual or liturgical service. Neither was there such a thing as infant membership. There were no popes, nor cardinals, nor archbishops, nor prelates ; no such a thing as Roman or English episcopacy ; no such forms of church government as those represented by Presbyterianism and Methodism. Nothing was known in the days of the apostles but the Church of Christ, with its plain and simple worship and government. The modern machinery of councils, assemblies, synods, presbyteries, and conferences is not to be found in the New Testament, or in the practice of the apostolic church. This fact settles their fate, disposes of their authority, and deprives them of all vitality. It is a sweeping and merciless logic that thus destroys, at one blow, the labor and work of centuries ; the inventions and appliances of great but mistaken men. But this is the vital and essential nature of truth. Light is not more destructive of darkness than is truth of error. It would be no longer truth if it were not thus merciless and destructive. Shall we shrink from it because of these inherent qualities ? Never.

We occupy a strong position ; we wield a mighty and sweeping principle. It is a sharp two-edged sword. It disarticulates the most difficult joints and dissects the minutest structures. It cuts down every hill and fills up every valley. It pulls down the strongholds of error and builds up those of truth. It is just as powerful in preserving as in destroying, and just as necessary and important. While it sweeps every obstruction from before us, it is just as potent to preserve us. It first redeems and then preserves. This is the essential nature and quality of the religion of Jesus ; and so long as we adhere strictly to it, we will escape the corruptions of a degenerate church, and be what Christ designed his church to be—the *LIGHT* of the world. The sun derives no light from the earth ; neither does the church, which Jesus redeemed, derive any light from this world. Its light must shine, or the world will be in darkness.

I have said that, in determining the practices of the apostolic church, we must consult Jewish history as well as the Christian Scriptures. This necessity arises from the fact that the Scriptures on certain subjects are merely didactic and allusory. This results from the fact that the subjects were familiar to the readers. For in-

stance, the Scriptures are not full and explicit on the worship and government of the church. Yet these subjects were well understood in the days of the apostles ; and when they were spoken of, but little more was necessary than a mere allusion. Hence the obscurity of the Scriptures on certain subjects to the modern reader. But these allusions can be verified and the obscurities cleared up by reference to external history, and this Jewish history. Such a reference is legitimate and necessary, because our religion originated among the Jews. The Lord and his apostles were Jews, educated under Jewish notions and customs. The converts for eight years were Jews ; the majority in every church were Jews. The leading men and officers of the church were Jews, so that we need not be surprised to find that the Christian church was modeled after the Jewish synagogue. It was in the synagogues of the Jews that Christ and his apostles first preached the gospel ; it was here they found hearers, and here where Christianity first got a foothold. For these reasons it is necessary and proper to have recourse to Jewish history in certain cases, in order to verify allusions in the Scriptures and clear up obscurities.

As it regards the worship and government of the apostolic church, two very important subjects, in reference to which many corruptions still exist and act as causes of divisions ; we must have recourse to Jewish history, and, guided by the divine record, seek a solution of our difficulties on these subjects ; and since the church was modeled after the synagogue in its worship and government, it is not only highly advantageous, but important and necessary to consult Jewish history to obtain a clear and full knowledge on these subjects.

As it regards worship, there were two kinds or forms under the Jewish institution. These were too distinct to be confounded. The one was instituted and regulated by statutory law ; the other grew out of the wants of the people, and was only an extension of the family worship of the patriarchal age. No provision was made for this kind or form of worship in the law ; no mention is made of it in the law, which fact shows that it constituted no part of the Jewish institution.

The first of these kinds of worship was the public worship of the tabernacle and temple. It was national in its character ; not social or devotional, and consisted of sacrifices, ordinances, rites, and ceremonies conducted by a legally ordained priesthood prescribed by the law. These priests were the only persons permitted by the law to take part in this worship, and they all belonged to one tribe. The women of all the tribes were cut off from this worship, even though inspired, so that this worship was peculiar in every respect.

With this form of worship nothing could have been in greater contrast than that of the synagogue. Here the men and women of all tribes could meet and worship ; here there were no distinctions made

in regard to any state or condition of society ; here there was only spiritual or devotional worship, a worship of the heart, and not one of symbols, rites, and ceremonies. In this worship there was no sacrifice of animals, no rites and ceremonies, no burning of incense, no priestly robes, no mitred priest, with his breastplate and urim and thummim ; nothing was found in the synagogue that pertained to the temple, because disallowed. It was devotional worship of the people, and not the symbolic worship of specially ordained priests and legally appointed sacrifices, rites, and ceremonies. It was grounded on piety, and came from the heart, and not on symbols and external ordinances. It consisted of praise, thanksgiving, and prayer, and was more precious in the sight of God than all burnt-offerings. Here the contrite heart prayed, and the soul, joyous and thankful, sang psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, and made melody in the heart. Here none were acceptable worshipers but those whose hands were clean, whose hearts were pure, and whose souls were not lifted up with vanity and pride. Synagogues were consequently found wherever there were pious Jews.

In striking contrast with this was the worship of the temple at Jerusalem, where worship was offered for the whole nation. After the building of the temple, the national worship was allowed only at Jerusalem. Here the priests resided ; here morning and evening sacrifices were daily offered. The services could be discharged as well by wicked as by godly priests. Moral character was not an element of the Jewish priesthood or the temple worshiper. He had only to serve according to the law, and the worship was genuine and acceptable, whether the offerer were a saint or a sinner in character. It was a legal worship, and not spiritual.

On certain great occasions, certain grand convocations of the people, the great mass of the people repaired to Jerusalem to take part in the worship of these occasions. Worship at these times consisted of one continual round of sacrifices at the brazen altar and in the sanctuary on the part of the priests, and on the part of the people in feasting, singing, dancing, and music on cornet, timbrel, and harp, the sound of trumpets and cymbals, and the general rejoicings of the whole people. All these things contrasted sharply with what transpired in the synagogue on the Sabbath days. The two kinds of worship were as distinct as flesh and spirit.

These two kinds of worship have their representatives under the Christian system. The synagogue has passed into the Christian church, and the temple worship found its end and fulfillment in the death of Jesus Christ on the cross, and his coronation as King and High-Priest in the heavens. Under his reign there is his synagogue or congregational worship on the earth, and, in the heavens, that part of the temple worship which consisted of praises, thanksgivings,

and rejoicings, where the saints, gathered out of all the nations of the earth, constitute the one great family or people of God ; and the worship coming up as from one great nation, the symbols of the national worship of the Jews are used to describe it.

The national or temple worship perished with the destruction of the Jewish metropolis by Titus. Being wholly national, it perished with the nation. Not a vestige remains. It served until the substance appeared ; and since the day of Christ's coronation, the temple worship has not ascended one inch toward heaven. All that now remains to the Jews is their synagogue. They have been stripped of all their ancient grandeur and glory. They are a people "scattered and peeled," and even their synagogue has been merged and lost in the church.

The temple worship was in perfect consonance with the genius, nature, and purpose of the Jewish institution. It was a system of external rites and ceremonies, whose only value was their symbolic character, and whose only purity that of the flesh, and only holiness ceremonial. It had no reference to the spirit—was not designed to reach the heart—and looked only to the purification of the flesh.

The synagogue worship was the opposite of this in every essential particular—spiritual in its nature and devotional in its character. It was only in the synagogue that spiritual worship was ever seen while the "first tabernacle was yet standing." It was in the synagogue that Jesus worshiped—never in the temple ; it was here that the first Christians worshiped God through Christ. The worship of the synagogue, therefore, was adapted to the spiritual worship of the church. The church, accordingly, was modeled after the synagogue. This being so, we will learn much of the worship of the apostolic church, by learning what was the worship of the synagogue.

This worship was simple in the extreme. It was adapted to every capacity, and was sufficient for the wants of all. All spiritual worship is plain and simple, and within the reach of all. It is like the historic style in composition compared with the poetic or symbolic. A religion of symbols is necessarily one of imagery and dress, of grand and imposing ceremonies. But such a religion can do no more than excite wonder, awe, and fear ; never can melt the heart to love, and give it the fearless confidence of the child. This fact is fully illustrated by the genius and history of the Jewish and Christian institutions.

The religion of Jesus being wholly spiritual, its worship is also spiritual. There is now no other kind of acceptable worship. He who worships God through Christ must worship him in spirit and in truth, for such only does God now accept.

Spiritual worship is always and necessarily plain and simple. Demanded of every heart, it must be such as every heart can give ; it

must be within the reach and grasp of the great mass of mankind. Hence, in ordaining the forms and instrumentalities of worship, the Holy Spirit had regard to the condition of man under all circumstances, and in every age of the world, however enlightened, refined, and cultivated the age might chance to be.

The Holy Spirit in organizing the Christian church adopted the government of the synagogue, as adapted to and adequate for all the wants and needs of the Christian in all ages and in all countries, whether barbarous, semi-barbarous, or civilized ; whether rude or refined. As we find the form or mode of worship portrayed in the Scriptures, and illustrated in the worship of the synagogue, such, we must conclude, it was left by the Holy Spirit ; and being left such by him, there is nothing left us but to accept it or reject him. We had as well, then, be ashamed of Christ as of the plain and simple worship of the apostolic church. If he ordained it, its simplicity can be no objection. If it suited Christ and his apostles, our refinement can not certainly be offended or shocked at its unpretentious simplicity.

We must never forget that it is not our province to determine what is or what is not acceptable worship. What pleases God should please us. But mankind have never been satisfied with what God has ordained ; and it seems the most difficult thing in the world to persuade men to be content with what he has ordained. If he prefers the worship of the heart to all burnt-offerings and sacrifices, why should men object ? Or if he suspends the salvation of the race on the obedience of the heart, why should we wish to make anything else, either different or additional, the ground of acceptance with God ? What God hath ordained is best, and it is our wisdom and piety to obey without a murmur.

I have now sketched in general outline the ground on which we stand, and stated the principle upon which we are proceeding, and adverted to some of the conclusions to which the logic of this step conducts us. The reasons and considerations which I have here presented are sufficient, I think, to show the wisdom, propriety, and absolute necessity of the step we have taken, and to justify this position and principle in the judgment of every intelligent and unbiassed mind.

Regarding, then, the wisdom, propriety, and necessity of the stand we have taken before the world as beyond any successful disturbance or reasonable objection, I proceed to the consideration of the subject which I have immediately in view, and to draw some practical conclusions which bear directly upon our own course of action ; and it must not be objected if the logic which has swept away the labor and hopes of great and good men of other days should prove as remorseless when applied to ourselves. Truth is a two-edged sword, and equally destructive of error, whether found in friend or foe.

The subject to which the foregoing remarks are but preliminary, and which I design to constitute my premises, is—*The use of instrumental music in the church of Christ.* With its use and value in other assemblies and for other purposes than that of worship I have no interest or concern whatever. I see no inconsistency in its use by religious parties whose very existence depends on human dictation. Its use by them should be no argument with us. We have proposed to ignore their existence, and can not, therefore, consistently borrow anything from them. I do not say that we can not learn anything from them. On the contrary, we may learn much. Their experience and history serve to show us, and confirm us in, the wisdom and propriety of the course we have marked out for ourselves from the sacred Scriptures. In reference to what the Scriptures teach, we are independent of them ; and as to what we desire to know in matters relating to our faith and practice, we propose to consult nothing but the oracles of God. It has been claimed by some that Jesus borrowed some of his moral precepts from the philosophers of Greece and Rome. But this is simply blasphemous. He was independent of all human sources of knowledge. He spoke from heaven. What he has left us is from God ; and since all that we have has been given us by God, why should we look to any other source ? We must not forget that our religion, and everything connected with it, is divine. We have originated nothing. We must take the church as the apostles left it, or as men have made or shall make it. One of these we must do. Which will we do ?

Did the Holy Spirit, then, ordain instrumental music in the church of Christ ? Or did he leave it to human wisdom and prudence to determine what shall be the mode of worship so far as regards the singing ?

The last of these questions can never be answered in the affirmative. In the absence of certain facts it might be inferred ; in their light it may be safely denied. These facts will appear as we proceed.

The first question can be answered in the negative. Instrumental music was not used in the Jewish synagogue ; and as the Christian church was modeled after it, it could not have been used in the apostolic church, unless specially ordained. The history of the church develops the fact that it was not used in any Christian assembly for several centuries after the death of the inspired men ; consequently it was not ordained by the Holy Spirit in the apostolic church. We can not believe that this was an accidental omission or an oversight. Nor can we believe that he was not fully acquainted with the power and influence of instrumental music over the heart, and knew perfectly well all its advantages in any and every particular, and in any and every age, and whether it was adapted to the spiritual worship of

the church. He knew that it had been used in the temple worship, and whether it ought to be ordained in the church. If, then, he did not ordain it in the church, what could have been the reason? If it were not an oversight, it must have been intentionally discarded. But it matters not with us what was the reason. We have the fact, and this, with Christians, should be all-sufficient. The fact, then, that the Holy Spirit did not ordain instrumental music in the apostolic church is an argument conclusive that he did not design that it should be used. This fact should be with us an end of all thought and desire on the subject.

It has, nevertheless, been introduced in the church, and for many centuries it has shown what influence it has on the psalmody of the church. Let us now look into its history and learn what character it has written on the scroll of time. For this purpose I will give an extract from Coleman's *History of the Apostolic and Primitive Church*, and one from his *Ancient Christianity Exemplified*. From the first I quote: "Both the Jews in their temple service and the Greeks in their idol worship were accustomed to sing with the accompaniment of instrumental music. The converts to Christianity, accordingly, must have been familiar with this mode of singing. * * * But it is generally admitted that the primitive Christians employed no instrumental music in their religious worship. Neither Ambrose, nor Basil, nor Chrysostom, in the noble encomiums which they severally pronounce on music, make any mention of instrumental music." (p. 130.)

In the apostolic church the music was entirely vocal and congregational. On this subject Chrysostom says: "It was the ancient custom, as it still is with us, for all to come together and unitedly join in singing. The young and the old, the rich and the poor, male and female, bond and free, all join in one song. All worldly distinctions here cease, and the whole congregation forms one general chorus. This interesting part of their worship was conducted in the same simplicity which characterized all of their proceedings. All unitedly sang their familiar psalms and hymns; each was invited at pleasure, and according to his ability, to lead the devotions in a sacred song indited by himself. Such was evidently the custom in the Corinthian Church, and such was still the custom in the age of Tertullian." These extracts establish the fact that instrumental music was not used in the church as late as A. D. 400, the age of Chrysostom.

This innovation on the worship of the apostolic church, like all other innovations and corruptions, came in gradually. The same author remarks that "an earlier period than the fifth or sixth century can hardly be assigned" as the period of the introduction of instrumental music. "Organs were unknown in the church until the eighth or ninth century. Previous to that time they had their place

in the theatre. They were never regarded with favor in the Eastern Church, and were vehemently opposed in many places in the West. In Scotland no organ is allowed to this very day, except in a few Episcopal churches. In the English Convention, held A. D. 1562, in Queen Elizabeth's time, for settling the Liturgy, the retaining of the organ was carried by a casting vote." (p. 376.)

The use of instrumental music in the church from the fifth century to the present day, a period of thirteen hundred years, gives it a history whose light will afford us some insight into its nature, tendency, and effects on the worship of the church, and discover, possibly, the reason why the Holy Spirit did not ordain it as an aid in spiritual worship. In regard to the nature and tendency of instrumental music as developed by its history, the same author says: "The tendency of instrumental music is to secularize the music of the church, and to encourage singing by a choir." The secularization of the music of the church was effected by the introduction of profane or secular music. On this subject the same author says: "The introduction of profane, secular music into the church was one of the principal means of corrupting the psalmody of the church." This effect proceeds from the nature of this kind of music. It is "artificial and theatrical in style, having no affinity to the worship of God;" and "when it took the place of those solemn airs which before had inspired the devotions of his people," congregational music perished. "The music of the theatre was transferred to the church, which accordingly became the scene of theatrical pomp and display, rather than the house of prayer and praise to inspire, by its appropriate and solemn rites, the spiritual worship of God. The consequences of indulging this depraved taste for secular music in the church are exhibited by Neander in the following extract: "We have to regret that, both in the Eastern and Western Church, their sacred music had assumed an artificial and theatrical character, and was so far removed from its original simplicity, that even in the fourth century Abbot Pambo, of Egypt, complained that heathen melodies had been introduced into their church psalmody." Others, as "Isidorus of Pelusium, complained of the theatrical singing, especially of the women, which, instead of inducing penitence for sin, tended much more to awaken sinful desires." And Jerome, in remarking on Eph. v., 19, says: "May all hear it who sing in the church—not with the voice, but with the heart, we sing praises to God. Not like the comedians, should they raise their sweet and liquid notes to entertain the assembly with theatrical songs and melodies in the church; but the fear of God, piety, and the knowledge of the Scriptures should inspire our songs. Then would not the voices of the singers, but the utterances of the divine word, expel the evil spirit from those who, like Saul, are possessed with one. But, instead of this, that same spirit is invited

rather to the possession of those who have converted the house of God into a pagan theatre."

The nature and tendency of instrumental music, and especially its effect on the worship of the church, are still more fully developed in another evil consequence of its introduction. This consequence is the transference of the singing from the congregation to a selected choir, the music of which, especially when accompanied by instruments, is confessedly beyond the reach of the congregation. On this point I quote : "The practice of sacred music as an ornamental, cultivated art, took it yet more completely from the people. It became an art which only a few could learn. The many, instead of uniting their hearts and voices in the songs of Zion, could only sit coldly by as spectators. A promiscuous assembly, very obviously, could not be expected to bear a prominent part in such music."

Other methods were used with the same object in view. "The clergy eventually claimed the right of performing the sacred music as a privilege exclusively their own ;" and "finally, the more effectually to exclude the people, the singing was in Latin." These latter methods have been abandoned in modern times, except the last, which still obtains in some Roman Catholic churches. Instrumental and choir music has been found fully adequate to the object of excluding the people from this part of the worship, and this almost universally obtains.

From these extracts it will be readily seen that one corruption attends or is soon followed by another. The one makes room for or constitutes the precedent for another. Hence the importance and necessity of eternal vigilance.

From *Ancient Christianity Exemplified* I quote : "The singing was congregational for the first three centuries. The charm of their music was not in the harmony of sweet sounds, but in the melody of the heart. * * * The singing was gradually drawn from the congregation and confined to a choir, which, in order to limit and confine this part of the worship to the choir, the style of the music was changed, so that the congregation were compelled to remit this part of the worship, and leave it in the hands of trained singers. Church music thus became a refined art of difficult attainment, and limited to the few professed singers. The congregation were, by the exigencies of their condition, excluded from all participation in it. The devotional tendency of sacred music was lost in the artistic style of its profane, secular airs. Thus, like our modern church, the ancient soon impaired the devotional tendency of sacred music by raising it above the congregation and limiting it to the choir, as they did their prayers by restricting them to the cold and formal rehearsal of the prayer-book."

Comment on these extracts is unnecessary. They speak for them-

selves. It is wonderful how much the modern resembles the ancient ; how little instrumental music in the worship of a spiritual religion, as regards its nature and tendency, differs in modern times from what it was in the days of its power and influence, when it developed its true nature and influence on this part of the worship of God. It is another evidence and example of how history repeats itself ; how the same principles will ever produce the same results.

History fully establishes the fact that for three centuries instrumental music was not used in the church ; and what reason can explain this fact, if not that it was designedly and purposely excluded ? It found no foothold in the church until the church had been corrupted in other respects ; until men had begun to correct the errors and omissions of divine wisdom, to adorn the simplicity of the primitive worship, and to improve on the apostolic teaching ; until human reason began to fasten its serpent fangs into the body of Christ. It had its origin in a state of things which gave existence to pedobaptism, and the corruptions which finally developed their legitimate fruits in the papacy.

It is a fact that musical instruments introduce an artistic style of music, far above the reach and capacity of any but amateurs or professional singers. Hence choirs of the present day, like those of former times, are almost universally composed of professional artists, those whose talents entitle them to expect and demand a remuneration for their choir services. They are employed to execute the singing ; and it is not strange that they should be more intent on exhibiting their musical powers and artistic taste than on the worship of God. Indeed, worship is rarely, if ever, a concomitant of such music, for choirs are seldom composed of godly persons ; and such is the nature and tendency of artistic music, that even if godly persons were to engage in it, they would not long remain so. They could not long resist its effects. Its nature and tendency is to engender pride, vanity, and worldly ambition, and these are passions which the young, who generally compose the choir, can rarely resist.

In many instances the singers are ungodly persons, and many not even professors, and known to be such when employed. The *music* is all that is sought. The advertisement calls for the *best voice* ; character is never thought of. All this may comport well with a corrupt and apostate church ; but to think of such a thing for the church of Christ is really horrible. It is shocking, or ought to be, to the weakest religious sense, to the feeblest conception of the essential nature of Christian worship. It ignores singing as any part of the worship of God, and regards it merely as a musical entertainment. It is not strange, therefore, that instrumental music, and all its concomitants, should be so heartily condemned by the great and good of all parties and of every age.

When sacred music becomes so highly artistic as to suit instruments and choirs, it degenerates into a mere musical entertainment ; and such is really its character in churches where instruments and choirs exist. It resembles more the orchestra music of theatres, which is designed to entertain the audience while the curtain is down, than spiritual worship, welling up from the soul in gratitude and praise to the great Fountain of life and blessing ; and the congregation has no more to do with the singing of choirs than the audience of the theatre has with the music of the orchestra. It is, therefore, just as reasonable to defend the withholding of the Bible from the people, or the performance of religious worship in a foreign tongue, as to advocate a measure which effectually takes from the congregation all participation in the worship of singing. Who can consistently defend the one and not the other ?

Instrumental music is even more objectionable than the use of a foreign tongue in any part of the worship. It has never been known that the ritual service in either the Roman or English church was performed by a man of the world. Wicked and ungodly men may in time have crept into the sacred office, but in every instance they have been recognized by the worshiping assembly as ordained and consecrated persons. But it is a well-known fact that ungodly and worldly men and women have discharged this part of the worship ; and worse than this, in some instances, the men have spent the time of preaching in a drinking saloon, while the women have killed the time in gossip or novel reading. This is worse than the ritual service of Romanism.

But it is objected that these things are merely accidental, and not a necessary consequence of the use of instrumental music, and by no means universal. That they are startling I am willing to admit, but that they are merely accidental the history of instrumental music positively denies, and not only denies, but establishes the contrary. It was not an accident that Eve sinned when she listened to the seductive pleas of Satan ; it was not an accident that the man became possessed with a demon when he had swept and garnished his house ; it was not an accident that the Jew became contaminated when he touched a dead body ; nor is it an accident that the wheat is choked out when the tares are sown in equal profusion. Principles possess power and character, and they communicate these to everything into which they are infused. A little leaven leavens the whole mass.

The isolated state of instrumental choirs, their conspicuous position, and especially the expectations that are formed of them, and the requirements made of them, all tend to engender pride, vanity, and worldly ambition, and to banish from the mind and to repress all religious feelings or sentiments in the hearts of the choristers. They are intent alone on executing their part well, that they may elicit the

approbation of the audience and the praises of men. What God thinks of their performance does not once disturb their thoughts ; the sentiment of worship is a stranger to their hearts ; they do not think that they have been praising God.

Still, it is insisted that these dark spots are merely accidents. In reply, I appeal to its history. It has there written its character as a corrupter of God's spiritual worship, as the destroyer of an ordinance of God, and the author of a spirit inimical to the spirit of Christ. If there be not something inherently vicious and injurious in its use, can any one imagine a reason why the Holy Spirit did not ordain such a powerful and beneficial aid to the human voice as this is claimed to be ? We can not say that he was ignorant of these excellencies, or incapable of appreciating fine music ; that he was rude, uncultivated, and below the standard of this modern age. And can any one imagine a reason why the ancient church for three centuries did not use instrumental music in the worship ? They were not ignorant of its use elsewhere, and possibly no less appreciative of its power and benefits than others. Its absence from the beginning could only have been the result of design.

We have now had some insight into its history, in which we have seen something of its nature, tendency, and effects. In this development we have discovered its influence for good or evil ; what it is capable of doing in elevating the style and character of church music, and in promoting piety and true spiritual worship. This history is sufficiently full and complete to be satisfactory.

As a people, therefore, pretending before the world to be laboring for the apostolic purity of the church ; claiming to have condemned all the corruptions and innovations which now disfigure and defile the church, and who esteem it their honor and glory, as it is, that they have proposed a greater work than that of Luther ; that they will be content with nothing less than the faith and practice of the apostolic church, such a people, I take it, can not adopt such an innovation, condemned even by themselves up to the present day, and such an instrument of corrupting and secularizing the church, without blushing at their inconsistency—without being conscious that they have abandoned their original ground and trampled under foot the great principle on which they are proceeding, and placed themselves among those who believe that the religion of Jesus, the gospel of the apostolic days, is too obsolete for the refinements of the present age, and too rude and simple to suit the intelligence and cultivation of modern times.

Standing on the ground and proceeding on the principle so frequently proclaimed before the world, that in all matters of religious faith and practice, the faith and practice of the apostolic church are our only guides and authorities, the introduction of instrumental mu-

sic into our congregations is simply a logical and moral impossibility. It can not be done without abandoning our ground and giving up our fundamental principle. We are compelled to discard this innovation on primitive practice, or give up all pretension and purpose of prosecuting any further the grand design of our reformatory movement. And if we have been right up to this time, to abandon this ground and principle would be nothing less than apostasy. To this dilemma are we driven by the most remorseless logic and by the highest considerations for honesty and consistency.

With such a history, with such facts and considerations before us, does it not sound strange to hear men say that no *principle* is involved in the use of instrumental music in Christian worship? Such persons can not surely have examined the subject. They can not have given the subject that consideration which its importance demands. Nor can it be said, with its nature, tendency, and effects before us, that it is a subject of no importance. It is not now a question of mere expediency, one in which no intrinsic character inheres. A tree with such fruit, an instrument with such a history, has a positive character for good or evil. It has passed the stage of experiment; it has passed into history and now possesses a character, and what this character is its history discovers.

But is there no principle involved in a measure with such a history? No principle involved in the use of a thing with such a nature, tendency, and effects, which has secularized the church, which has destroyed and will ever destroy congregational worship, which engenders pride, vanity, ambition, and worldly-mindedness! No principle involved in a matter, the bare proposal of which excites alarm for the spiritual welfare of the church, that wounds the feelings of a great brotherhood, that mantles the cheek of many great and good among us with shame and mortification, that makes the heart of many bleed for a cause wounded by its friends! Strange, passing strange, that so many whose intelligence and piety can not be questioned, should so vehemently oppose a measure so innocent and beneficent!

Wherever there is principle involved, there also is Christian morality. The question, therefore, becomes one of Christian morality, because of which he who acts must first examine before he decides.

With the history of this innovation before the mind, love weeps tears of grief at the serious proposal of a thing so prolific of mischief. Is it, then, of love to urge a measure against the deep convictions of almost an entire brotherhood? What is the spirit that would urge a measure against the solemn and affectionate protest of the soundest and best men in our ranks? If this opposition came from ignorant and unreasonable men, the friends of the measure might be excused for any little restiveness or impatience they might manifest under this opposition. But I submit that the opposition is neither ignorant nor

unreasonable. They have always been ready to give, and have repeatedly given, the reasons which compel them to resist the introduction of this innovation. I have endeavored to embody these reasons in an argumentative form, that you may know why I feel constrained to resist it. I have spoken the deep convictions of my mind, from the depths of my heart, and because of the profound interest and solicitude I feel for the welfare of this church, for its standing before the world, and especially for its standing before God. I must believe that the reasons and considerations which I have here presented free me from all charge of prejudice. I have not prejudged the question. My convictions are the fruit of testimony, and a part of this testimony I have now submitted for your serious and candid consideration. I do not believe that there is one fact, argument, or plea that can stand before the facts and considerations now submitted. No support can be derived from Jewish sources, from either the temple or synagogue worship. There was no fact or precedent unknown to the Holy Spirit when he ordained the worship of the church; and unless we are prepared to charge him with an oversight, or a thoughtless omission, we must conclude that what was not ordained was what he intentionally designed not to ordain. It is much safer and wiser to take things as the Holy Spirit left them, and attempt no corrections on divine wisdom and ordination.

The great plea for the use of instrumental music, and especially for the organ, is that it improves the singing, and attracts public attention to the gospel. It is a great pity that the Holy Spirit did not know this, or knowing it, did not consider it. If the singing of the church were merely a musical entertainment, a device to attract the attention of the passer-by, like the music at a circus or strawberry festival, there might be some reason or force in the consideration. But, since singing is an act of worship, a devotional service offered to God, and derives all its value and importance from the estimate which he places on it, it is manifestly the suggestion of reason and common sense that our first inquiry and desire should be to know what kind of music is pleasing and acceptable to God, not what will gratify and please the ear and attract the attention of the world. Because it is an act of worship, a thought or a desire not germane to it, is positively forbidden.

It is not denied that choir singing is more elegant and artistic, as these qualities are viewed by professional men, than congregational. But this is not the question. The question for Christians to consider is, Which did God ordain; and what are the effects and influence which an artistic style of music has on this part of the worship, to say nothing of its influence in other directions? Its history establishes the fact that such music destroys the worship ordained by God. The two can not live and flourish together. No fact connected with its history is better established than this.

I can not, therefore, see in all my horizon one fact, argument, reason, or plea, that can justify us in using musical instruments in the worship of the church. It is an innovation on apostolic practice. This can not be controverted. It is such an innovation, too, that prepares the way for other and equally destructive innovations. Such is its history in the past, and such is the complaint made of it at the present day, and this, too, by those who have tried its wonderful advantages. A late Episcopalian paper has the following: "The progress of so-called ritualism among us has been promoted more through the insidious introduction and multiplication of musical performances than through any other means." This language coming from an Episcopalian is very significant. He seems to think that it was not introduced by the fairest of means, and characterizes the choir and instrumental music as a musical performance! This language might be considered offensive coming from any other quarter, but coming from one who has not been an idle spectator, nor ignorant of the drift and tendency of things, it carries with it an authority of more than ordinary weight. Experience with the wise is a good and an effectual teacher. Horace says it is lawful to learn even from an enemy. Let us learn from the experience of others and be content with what God has ordained, and suffer instrumental music and all its concomitants to remain where they were born, amid the corruptions of an apostate church.

DR. CHRISTOPHER'S ARTICLE.—It is with real pleasure that I give this tranquil and excellent article to the readers of the *Quarterly*. I do not remember to have seen anything better on the topic of which it treats. I deem it simply conclusive against the use of instrumental music in the churches of Christ. In the fear of God I hope all the Disciples will read it.

The question of instrumental music in the churches of Christ involves a great and sacred principle. But for this the subject is not worthy of one thought at the hands of the child of God. That principle is the right of men to introduce innovations into the prescribed worship of God. This right we utterly deny. The advocates of instrumental music affirm it. This makes the issue. As sure as the Bible is a divine book, we are right and they are wrong. Time and facts will prove the truth of this. The churches of Christ will be wrecked the day the adverse side triumphs; and I live in fear that it will do it. Our brethren are now freely introducing melodeons into their Sunday schools. This is but the first step to the act, I fear. As soon as the children of these schools go into the church, in goes the instrument with them. Mark this.

O.'S THEORY IN REGARD TO THE MILLENNIUM.

In the July number of the *Quarterly* (1867), the editor has favored us with a defense of his theory of the millennium, marked, for the most part, by his usual modesty and ability. The concluding paragraph is as follows : "But surely my brother O. will not ask me to do what he is himself unwilling to be asked to do. He has a theory of the millennium. Here now I call on him to affirm it, item by item, and prove it on the pages of the *Quarterly*. Already I shrewdly divine his theory ; and though I am not willing to anticipate him, yet I fear not to hazard the conjecture that, when spread out, it would be difficult to find a more complete concatenation of guesses than it will be. The school to which he belongs has spoken heretofore. But we shall now see the difference between affirming for others and asking them to prove, and affirming ourselves and proving. I repeat, we shall see."

Though I am a little puzzled to understand what good the editor expects to result from having a "complete concatenation of guesses" spread out upon his pages, I can not deny the justness and fairness of the demand made upon me. And if, in yielding to it, the editor's conjecture is realized, he, doubtless, can turn it to profitable account.

O. certainly has a theory—not, perhaps, precisely a theory of the millennium ; nevertheless, a theory of the future of the human race, covering the whole period from the present time down to the final consummation of all terrestrial things, to the period when the wicked will go away into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. In regard to this theory, it is certainly not impossible that he may be wrong ; nevertheless, to my own mind at least, it, and every item in it, seems to be clearly taught in the New Testament. Of course, I can not object to affirming it item by item, and proving it upon the pages of the *Quarterly*, or at least attempting to prove it.

But so far as the editor's theory and my own are identical, rest upon the same proofs, and are supported and elucidated by the same arguments,—proofs and arguments which have been already adduced by the editor, with a clearness and force which can not be excelled,—nothing further need be here offered.

That Christ will return to this earth as really, truly, and literally as he left it ; that from the present time until he does come, the moral and religious condition of the world will remain substantially what it now is,—the same world, the same flesh, and the same devil to contend with, and with no other armor for the conflict than that which we now

have, the gospel of Christ ; that when Christ comes the righteous dead will be raised, and the righteous living changed, "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," all this I believe as confidently as does the editor. These are items in my theory, already affirmed item by item, and proved,—proved clearly, and conclusively, I think. With me, though items of a theory, they are also items of faith.

Thus far the two theories are in harmony ; from this point they begin to diverge. Here I will begin to affirm and prove. And as there are four distinct items in the preceding, I will begin with item number five.

V.—*At the coming of Christ the wicked dead will also be raised.* That is to say, that all the dead, the righteous and the wicked, will be raised at the same time. I do not deny but that they will be raised in different ranks. But the Greek word *tagma*, in the common version rendered order, but more correctly, by the editor, rendered "rank," is a military term, equivalent to the English word rank or company. It has no allusion to time. There can be different ranks raised at the same time, as well as at different times.

If I am correct in the position that at the coming of Christ the wicked dead will be raised as well as the righteous dead, then is the editor's theory wrong. If, on the contrary, I am wrong in this, then is the editor's theory probably correct. It is an important point, and it would be strange if the Scriptures had left it in such a condition, that there could be reasonable grounds for doubt in regard to it.

In Paul's defense before the Jewish council, we have the following statement : "But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council : Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." (Acts xxiii., 6.) This language is exceedingly suggestive. If Paul had believed in two resurrections, to be separated from each other by the period of a thousand years, would he not have said "of the hope and resurrections of the dead." His language would have been plural, not singular.

Again : when arraigned before the governor, he said : "But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets ; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." (Acts xxiv., 14, 15.) Here there is to be, not two several resurrections, but "a resurrection of the dead ;" and this one resurrection is to embrace both the just and the unjust.

Jesus says : "Marvel not at this ; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life ; and

they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John v., 28, 29.) Here again, are both classes raised; those who have done good, and those who have done evil; the former to life, and the latter to damnation. But they are raised at the same time, the same "hour," and at the sound of the same "voice." That this language teaches the simultaneous resurrection of "all that are in the graves;" those that have done good, not more certainly than those who have done evil, it seems to me is too plain to require argument. One voice is to call them all forth from their graves; and they are all to come forth at the same time, in the same hour. I lay no special stress upon the word hour, or the fact that this word is used rather than the word day, or some other designation of time; though I see no reason to doubt but what the resurrection of all, both the good and the bad, will be literally in the same hour, in the same instant of time. When the Son of man comes, it will be like the lightning that shineth from the east even unto the west. And when his voice, "the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God," is heard,—and we have no intimation that it will be sounded more than once,—in an instant, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, the dead in Christ will be raised, and the living saints changed; and in the same instant, in the same hour, and when the same "voice" is heard, the wicked dead will also be raised.

In neither of the preceding proof-texts is there anything said about the coming of Christ. But as it is conceded that the righteous dead are to be raised at his coming, if these Scriptures prove that the wicked dead will be raised at the same time the righteous dead are, then will both be raised at the coming of Christ. That such is the teaching of these passages of Holy Writ, we do not entertain a doubt.

VI.—*At the coming of Christ, the final judgment of the quick and the dead, the saint and the sinner, will take place.* It will be seen that this proposition is cumulative of the preceding; for if it is true that at the coming of Christ the living and the dead, the saint and the sinner, will all be judged, then, *ex necessitate*, all the dead, good and bad, must be raised at that time; and every proof of the judgment of all, at the coming of Christ, is an equally conclusive proof of the resurrection of all at that time.

In Paul's celebrated speech on Mars' Hill, he informed the Athenians that God "now commands all men everywhere to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." It will be noted here that the judgment of all is to be at the same time, not the judgment of the righteous at one time, and the wicked at an other.

In Rom. ii., 5-16, we are taught that God will "render to every man according to his deeds;" "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men" according to the gospel. "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the

hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." (1 Cor. iv., 5.) "I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." (2 Tim. iv., 1.)

Beyond all controversy, these Scriptures teach that at the coming of Christ the judgment of all, saint and sinner, quick and dead, will take place. Language could scarcely be so framed as to express this idea with more definiteness and certainty than it is expressed in these passages of Scripture; and since at that judgment "we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ" (Rom. xiv., 10), of necessity all the dead must be raised at the coming of Christ.

But the New Testament teems with testimony to the same effect: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels; and then shall he reward every man according to his works." (Matt. xvi., 27.) "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats. * * * And these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. xxv., 31-46.) "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day." (2 Thess. i., 7-10.) "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying: Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have impiously committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude, 14, 15.)

Though there is much more testimony to the same effect, surely this must be deemed entirely sufficient. If this is not sufficient, no amount would be. As to the definiteness and precision of this testimony, it would be difficult to conceive how it could be rendered more so. There are no words in the English language, no modes of expression that could be used, better calculated to convey the idea that at the very time of the coming of Christ the entire human family will appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and be judged for the deeds done in the body. If this is not proved, proved clearly and beyond all doubt and difficulty, it does seem to me that nothing can be proved.

VII.—*At the second coming of Christ, the righteous will enter upon*

their final reward, in heaven. That there is somewhere in the universe a place that is called heaven, not merely the atmospheric heaven through which the clouds of heaven float, nor the vast expanse wherein the stars of heaven revolve ; but the "dwelling place" of God and the holy angels ; the place from which Christ came to earth, and to which he returned when he left the earth, and where he now sits at the right hand of God, does not admit of a question with those who believe the Bible. I now affirm, that in this place called heaven the righteous, at the coming of Christ, will enter upon their final reward. That at least two human beings, to wit, Enoch and Elijah, have already gone there, and that Christ has gone there, are facts so clearly taught, that it is presumed none will call them in question. That all the saints will eventually reach the same blessed abode is just as clearly taught. Jesus says : "Rejoice, and be exceeding glad ; for great is your reward in heaven." (Matt. v., 12.) He said to the rich young man : "One thing thou lackest ; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." (Mark x., 21.) Paul says : "For our (*politeuma*) citizenship is in heaven." (Phil. iii., 20.) And he speaks of "the hope which is laid up for us in heaven." (Col. i., 5.) He says to the Hebrews : "For ye had compassion of me in my bonds, and took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing in yourselves that ye have in heaven a better and an enduring substance." (Heb. x., 34.) Peter says : "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you." (1 Peter i., 3, 4.) Of the hope set before us, Paul says : "Which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil ; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus." (Heb. vi., 19, 20.) Our hope entereth to that within the veil. This is an allusion to the veil which intervened between the first and the second tabernacles ; "the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shewbread ; which is called the sanctuary. And after the second, the tabernacle which is called the holiest of all ; which had the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant ; and over it the cherubim of glory shadowing the mercy-seat." (Heb. ix., 2-5.) "These were but figures for the time then present." The first tabernacle, the figure of the church on earth ; and the second tabernacle, the figure of the real "holy place," or "heaven itself." "But Christ being come a high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building ; neither

by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." (Heb. ix., 11, 12.) "It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these ; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ has not entered into the holy place made with hands, which are the figures of the true ; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (Heb. ix., 23, 24.)

When, therefore, it is said that our hope "entereth into that within the veil," the meaning is clearly that it entereth into heaven itself. And when it is said, "whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus," it is clear that the meaning is, not only that Jesus has entered into heaven itself, but that he has entered there as our forerunner. A "forerunner" is defined to be, "a messenger sent before to give notice of the approach of others ; a harbinger ; a precursor." Christ has gone to heaven as our forerunner, to herald our coming. So that not only is it true that the Christian's hope embraces "an inheritance, incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven" for him ; but it actually "enters into that within the veil," into heaven itself ; it is firmly anchored there, and Christ, our elder brother, has himself entered there as our forerunner, our harbinger, our precursor, entered there to herald our coming, and prepare places for us.

Again : Jesus said to the Jewish officers whom the Pharisees and chief priests sent to take him : "Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go unto him that sent me. Ye shall seek me ; and where I am thither ye can not come." (John vii., 33, 34.) "Then said Jesus again unto them : I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins ; whither I go ye can not come." (John viii., 21.) Is not the inference irresistible, that the only reason why they could not go where he was going was because they would die in their sins ? If so, is not the inference equally legitimate that those who do not die in their sins will go to the place whither Jesus was going ? After this, Jesus said to his disciples : "Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me ; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go ye can not come ; so now I say to you. * * * Simon Peter said unto him : Lord, whither goest thou ? Jesus answered him : Whither I go, thou canst not follow me now ; but thou shalt follow me afterward." (John xiii., 33-36.)

Now, that Christ has gone to heaven, is a proposition about which there can be no doubt. It is equally certain that heaven is the place to which those Jews to whom Jesus spoke could never go, because they would die in their sins. Nor can there be any doubt but that heaven is the place to which Peter and the other disciples could not follow him then, but should follow him afterward. He has gone there as their forerunner, and they will most certainly follow him to the same place afterward.

But when will the saints follow Christ to heaven, whither he is now gone as their forerunner? Not until he comes again. "Let not your hearts be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." (John xiv., 1-3.)

It does seem to me that this language is so plain, that "none by comment could it plainer make." If it is not true that our treasure, our reward, our citizenship, and our hope are in heaven; if it is not true that Christ has entered heaven as our forerunner, and to prepare a place for us; if it is not true that, though we can not follow him to heaven now, we shall follow him there afterward; if it is not true that, having gone to heaven as our forerunner, and to prepare a place there for us, Christ will come again, not to remain with us on earth, but to receive us unto himself in heaven; not to be with us where we are, but that we may be with him where he is, i. e., in heaven; I say, if all this is not true, then, alas! how can we place any confidence in anything contained in the Bible?

I do not forget that the editor, in his first essay on this subject, said: "The notion, so very prevalent, that the Christian's future home lies away in some immeasurably distant region is only a vulgar error. No foundation whatever exists for it." (Vol. ii., p. 21.) Nor do I forget the exquisite pain the reading of these two sentences gave me. I do not pretend to know whether or not heaven is "in some immeasurably distant region." But if the "notion" that the Christian's future home is in heaven, and not on earth, "is only a vulgar error," it is one into which Christ and his apostles have led me. And if any confidence can be placed in the sweet and cheering promise of Christ, the "exceeding great and precious promises" which he has given us, it is certainly a mistake to say that "no foundation whatever exists" for the "notion" that he will come again and receive us unto himself, that where he is—in heaven—there we may be also. I trust the editor will in future treat our "vulgar error" a little more gently; for I confess that the hope of heaven, the hope that enters into that within the veil; the hope of spending a blissful eternity in the presence of God, where there is fullness of joy, is immeasurably more cheering to me, and seems immeasurably more grand and glorious, and to rest upon an infinitely better foundation, than the hope of endless bliss on earth, which is so enrapturing to some.

VIII.—*At the second coming of Christ, the wicked will enter upon their everlasting punishment.* The proofs of this proposition have already been abundantly adduced: "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, and then he shall reward every man ac-

ording to his works." It is "when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him," that he shall sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats; "and these (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be (*anathema maran-atha*) accursed, when the Lord comes;" or, let him be accursed, the Lord comes. (1 Cor. xvi., 22.)

In all these passages, and many others that might be cited, the time of the punishment of the wicked is definitely fixed at the coming of Christ. To that period their punishment is tied down. As well might we deny that they will be punished at all, as deny that they will be punished when Christ comes. It is not more clearly taught that Jesus is the Christ, than that at his second coming the wicked will be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power; that at that time the wicked will go away into everlasting punishment. It is difficult to conceive how any collocation of words could more emphatically express this than it is already expressed in these Scriptures. And there is nothing to limit this punishment of the wicked to those only who may chance to be alive at the coming of Christ. It evidently embraces all the wicked, of all nations and of all ages. Nor can this punishment be regarded as merely temporary—be limited to the death of the wicked which may be then living. It is the final separation of the wicked from the righteous, and their "eternal punishment."

IX.—*At the coming of Christ, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.* That the events predicted in the third chapter of 2d Peter are immediately connected with the second coming of Christ is evident from the fourth verse, where scoffers are represented as saying: "Where is the promise of his coming?" The coming of the Lord, then, is that event unto which the heavens and the earth, which are now, are kept in store, "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men" (verse 7). It is to the coming of the Lord that reference is made when he says (chap. ii., 9): "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." To the same day of judgment, at the coming of Christ, he refers again (chap. ii., 4): "For if God spared not the angels that

sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment." And it is to the same coming of the Lord that he refers (chap. iii., 10) : "But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." To this day of judgment, then, at the coming of the Lord, several things are reserved. 1. The angels that sinned, who have been cast down to Tartarus, and delivered into chains of darkness, are "to be reserved unto judgment." 2. God "reserves the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 3. And "the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." It is at this time, the coming of the Lord, the day of judgment, and the day of the perdition or punishment of ungodly men and sinful angels, that "the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

Thus ends this sin-cursed earth, the scene of so much sin, sorrow, sickness, and pain ! It is the last any man knows, or can know, in regard to it. God's word says it shall be "burned up." Heaven and earth shall pass away, but God's word shall never fail.

I do not forget that the editor has a fancy that this burning up of the earth is only a "change." He says : "It appears, then, that no change will take place in the earth at the commencement of the millennium," etc. "This, therefore, seems a fitting time to renew both earth and heaven." "And now to this earth, thus refitted up; the saints return to dwell forever and forever." (*Quarterly*, vol. ii., p. 21.)

Now whence comes this idea of renewing the earth, of refitting it up, and of the saints returning to it ? Surely not from the Bible. It contains no intimation of any such events. True, we have the promise of new heavens and a new earth ; but whatever may be the precise meaning of this promise, there is not the slightest intimation that the new earth will merely be the old one renewed—"refitted up." The earth and the works that are therein will be burned up ; that is all the information we have on the subject. Whether or not the material of which it is composed will enter into the composition of any other globe, we are not informed. I am content to leave the subject where the inspired penman leaves it.

My theory is now before the reader. As far as it relates to the millennium, it is simply this :

1. That the Bible says nothing concerning the millennium, in the current acceptation of that term. The word is not used in the Bible, nor is the idea ordinarily associated with the word contained in that book.

2. That the Bible leaves no space—no room, so to speak—for a

thousand years of sinless, painless bliss on this earth, between the present time and the final dissolution of the earth, the consignment of the wicked into eternal perdition, and the entrance of the saints upon their endless life of bliss in heaven.

And as to the events usually supposed to be associated with the millennium, my theory is :

1. That Christ will actually and really return, in his own proper person, to this earth.

2. That from the present time until Christ comes again, the moral and religious condition of the world will be much the same as it now is ; not much better, not much worse.

3. That when Christ comes the righteous dead will be all raised.

4. That when Christ comes the righteous living will all be changed.

5. That when Christ comes the wicked dead will also be raised.

6. That when Christ comes all men—the quick and the dead, the saint and the sinner—will stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and be judged according to the works done in the body.

7. That at the coming of Christ the wicked will go away into eternal punishment—be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.

8. That at the coming of Christ he will receive his saints unto himself, in heaven, that where he is, there they may be also.

9. That at the coming of Christ the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.

This is my theory. It is more ; it is my belief. If there is any item in it which is not proved, clearly and definitely, by most explicit and unambiguous testimony, I confess I am not able to see which one it is.

But to advert for a single moment more to the point of divergence in the two theories. In my first article I said : "It may be difficult to prove, by any fair reasoning and correct exegesis of Scripture, that there are literally to be two resurrections—that of the righteous, at the beginning of the millennium, and that of the wicked at its close." To this the editor replies : "There is not the semblance of difficulty in the case. The Scriptures roundly and undeniably assert two resurrections ; and if their assertion is not to be taken for two, neither is it for one," whereupon he quotes Green's translation of Rev. xx., 4, 5.

Still, with all due deference, I must think there are at least two difficulties in the way :

1. The first difficulty is, that the supposed proof is in a portion of the Bible universally admitted—admitted by the editor himself—to be exceedingly difficult of interpretation.

2. The second difficulty is, that if, "by any fair reasoning and correct exegesis of Rev. xx., 4, 5, it can be made to teach "that there are

literally to be two resurrections—that of the righteous at the beginning of the millennium, and that of the wicked at its close,” then it will be clearly and squarely in contradiction of the teachings of Jude, and Peter, and Paul, and Christ himself.

As to the first of these points, I beg leave to quote from the editor's first essay on this subject, in which he said : “What he (John) then saw by the spirit of inspiration he has jotted down. We are now engaged in an effort to read his handwriting or interpret his hieroglyphics.” “By this we do not mean that the Book of Revelation contains no difficult passages. We know of no book which contains more.” “Its language is for the most part confessedly figurative ; its conceptions are highly wrought, while the drapery of its scenes is gorgeous even up to the height of sublimity.” Again, after quoting chap. xix., 17, 18, he says : “This, as previously stated, was to John a vision, a view, a picture ; but a picture of what ? What is its counterpart, or what answers to it ? We can not have a picture without its being the picture of something. What now is the thing or scene of which we here have the picture or representation ?” Once more : “I confess I feel tied down here to uncertainty. The great difficulty in interpreting the Book of Revelation is not in understanding the things which John saw. These he causes us to see very plainly. In other words, he describes to us his pictures well, but the difficulty lies in our inability to determine what the various parts of his pictures represent.”

Now, this is one of the very difficulties in the way of the editor proving from this passage that there will literally be two resurrections, a thousand years apart. What John saw in this vision we are told plainly enough ; “but the difficulty lies in our inability to determine what the various parts of his pictures represent.” That the editor has made an honest “effort to read his handwriting, or interpret his hieroglyphics,” I have no doubt ; nor have I any doubt that he has failed in that effort, or that his effort will continue to be a failure so long as it is conducted upon the hypothesis that John's visions are “pictures of corresponding realities.”

In my former paper I made various suggestions as to the proper mode of interpreting John's visions. These suggestions the editor has studiously refrained from noticing. In presenting my theory, and attempting to prove the several items of which it is composed, I have just as studiously refrained from drawing any of my proofs from the Book of Revelation. I thought the meaning which the editor evidently attached to certain portions of this book clearly wrong, and sought to convince him of it upon general principles. In this I failed. I now seek to do the same thing by showing that the interpretation he gives to Rev. xx., 4, 5, is in conflict with other plain and unambiguous portions of the New Testament.

I must therefore deny that the Scriptures, anywhere, "roundly and undeniably assert two resurrections." On the contrary, I must insist that Christ "roundly and undeniably asserts" that there will be but one resurrection; that all that "are in the graves" will come forth at one time, in one hour, and at the sound of one voice; and that what Christ and all his apostles have taught us, to wit, that the judgment of all, the eternal punishment of the wicked, and the final reward of the righteous, will take place at the coming of Christ, renders it impossible that there can be two resurrections, one thousand years apart, after Christ comes.

Surely the editor will not be so confident that he has been successful in his effort to read John's handwriting and interpret his hieroglyphics, that he will reject what is plainly taught by Christ and his apostles because it does not harmonize with his reading of that handwriting, or his interpretation of those hieroglyphics. Since it is admitted that there is a "great difficulty in interpreting the Book of Revelation," a difficulty which does not exist in the interpretation of other portions of the New Testament, I feel well assured the editor will not reject what is elsewhere taught because of any uncertainty as to the meaning of any portions of this book. Any person may well feel "diffident and cautious" in regard to any theory which rests wholly or mainly upon any interpretation of this most difficult book in the New Testament.

In conclusion I have only to say, that if, in stating and attempting to prove my own theory, I have been led into a tone of too much positiveness—a tone that borders upon dogmatism—I regret it, for no one is more averse to dogmatism than I am. But feeling a strong conviction of the correctness of my propositions, I could not, without a lack of frankness and candor, speak of them doubtfully. I have felt no doubt, and could express none. Yet, to err is human, and I claim no exemption from the ordinary frailty of the race. It is therefore possible that I may be wrong in my theory, in my belief, on this subject. If so, I trust I love the truth sufficiently to be willing to be convinced. But until better advised, my theory is such as I have developed herein. That many men of vastly more learning and ability than I can lay any just claim to, have arrived at very different conclusions I cheerfully admit. Yet, with the lights before me at the present time, the foregoing theory appears to me to be as clearly taught as any other truths in the New Testament. I have, therefore, not discussed the different items in it "only as probabilities, or as items in a mere theory." If in this I have yielded to the editor the vantage-ground which he claims, it was because I felt that the Bible afforded something more than mere "probabilities" in regard to the future.

O.

"IT IS THE POWER."

"FOR I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God in order to salvation to every one that believes; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Romans i., 16.)

Paul was not ashamed of the gospel. Many, in this day of grace, in circumstances far less opposing and humiliating than those were which surrounded the apostle Paul are ashamed of the gospel, especially are they ashamed of the simplicity of the gospel, or rather of it simply. To many it is, as it was to the learned Greeks, foolishness. With them it is not the power, nor even a power of God, in order to salvation, without an addition which it is claimed God makes to it. The very most that is allowed is, that the gospel is generally the medium through which this other distinct and only essential power of God operates. This view regards the "Holy Ghost" as the power of God for salvation, whereas the gospel is only the medium through which, or the instrument by which, it works. The gospel is, then, not only not the only power, but it is not the chief power. This conclusion is untrue, or the translation at the head is wrong. Therefore he that accepts the conclusion, must alter the translation. But the translation can not be changed materially. It has, I believe, never been done. It is said somewhere that all things begin in miracle, and this, allowing a little explanation, is true. It is equally true that things do not continue in miracle; that is, reproduction, whether of beings or blessings is by law. The blessing is, then, in the appointment of God, and never out of it; nor can it be had without it. The power of light and heat to bless is in the rays of the sun. The power for slaking thirst is in the water. The power of germination is in the seed. The power of sustaining animal life is in the food, etc. In a word, the power of God to bless is in the appointments of God. Each appointment carries always in it, and hence brings with it its own peculiar blessing. The blessing always goes with the appointed means of it, and is secured by compliance with specific conditions, but not otherwise. In the kingdom of nature this is certainly true. After the power to bless is conferred upon or located in water, earth, air, or fire, we go to these elements of the old philosophers with the conviction that their respective blessings are in them. God has put his blessings in them; therefore it robs him not to so teach. Is it not as true in the kingdom of heaven? The word of God is the good seed of the kingdom, and in that word or seed resides the gospel or power of God for salvation. It is in it; not extrinsically, but intrinsically. To take the power

from the gospel, if that could be, would be to take its life, to kill it. The Christian, with an intelligent faith, goes forth tearfully, to sow the good seed, with the assurance that God's energy for salvation is in it. Paul so understood it, and gives that as the reason why he was not ashamed of the gospel.

It is said that in the Holy Land there is a large trumpet-shaped leaf, which at night turns its mouth toward heaven to catch the dew as it falls. Each morning the leaf is full, but before night is empty and drooping. Stephens, I think it is, gives it as his opinion, that the Eunuch was baptized out of one of these leaves. So it is thought that the gospel is only a sort of receptacle for the real power; that when the power comes, then the gospel is the power; but when it does not, then the gospel is of but little force. Add to this the fact, conceded by the advocates of the addition theory, that the real power is generally absent, and you have before you the worthless thing the gospel is in the estimation of a sectarian preacher. Paul, without making an addition, declares that the gospel is *the power*. Whether certain sectarians put more confidence in the gospel, or in the other power, may be determined from their works. Do they not call for power to come down and convert sinners? Do they not ask God to send down converting power? Do they not teach sinners to seek the Spirit to enlighten and save them? So Paul never taught. He taught sinners to receive with meekness the engrafted word of God, which is able, or has the power, to save the soul.

There is no mistaking the evidences which we have that sectarian teachers rely, and teach the sinner to rely, principally if not entirely, upon the power which is out of the gospel and does not belong necessarily to it. This is masked infidelity, that is now settling over our land like a pall and is more hurtful than a pestilence. Like Elymas the sorcerer, who tried to turn the deputy from the faith, this doctrine has turned its thousands from God. Now does any one believe that Paul had such a hollow, soulless thing before him as this view represents the gospel to be? Certainly no one should. Paul had real faith in the gospel.

If the gospel is really the power of God for salvation, and his only power, then any attempt to invoke or employ another power is wicked; or it is, at least, unrighteous, and must in effect prove a failure. Besides, to the full extent that the sinner is brought to believe in the efficiency of this human addition, will he be inclined to discredit Paul's statement concerning the gospel's power.

But it may be replied: It is illogical to conclude, that because the gospel is God's power it is therefore his only power. I grant that this is true. The conclusion that the gospel is God's only power does not follow from the fact that it is his power for salvation. It, at least, does not necessarily follow. But since it is asserted act-

ually that the gospel is God's power for salvation, it is most illogical to allow that there is another power, unless it is plainly proved. It would not do to prove that another power might or could be employed ; it must be shown that another power is really and distinctly ordained for salvation, else its existence must be denied. Our opponents have never, or at least seldom, dealt fairly with us on this question. They have generally required us to prove that there is no other power, to prove a negative ; whereas, they ought in fairness to prove what they affirm : That there is another power. Should they attempt to prove it by the introduction of human experience, I would be compelled to object to the competency of the witness. Human experience is indispensable in the examination and settlement of questions raised in the rational and natural sciences. Here it must be relied upon. But to suppose that we may rightly question nature, including man, soul and body, in order to know God's will on the subject of man's salvation is to make a very great mistake. Paul teaches, in 1 Cor. ii., 11, that no one can know the things of God, including, of course, God's will or law for salvation, unless God should by his Spirit reveal it. Of course, then, human testimony must be rejected. The proof that there is, in the economy of God, a power distinct from the gospel for salvation must be divine.

I raise not the question whether the power is intellectual, moral, or physical ; nor do I propose to show how the gospel is the power ; nor yet whether it is direct or indirect in its mode of operation. The only question here raised is, Is there another power besides the gospel which is of God for the salvation of the sinner ? It might possibly be shown that if the entire resources of the infinite God were before us, so far as they are known to man, a power could not be found greater than is the gospel, and that it is so great that we are unable to conceive how anything could be added. But my object in this article is simply to respond to the following question : Is there another power ? Or more fully : Is there another power of God for the salvation of the sinner ? I think not. Few, feeble, and enfeebling have been the attempts to establish the affirmative. Its advocates, too, have generally left printed evidence of a consciousness of failure not well concealed. Nothing but the stubborn influence of long-cherished opinion, and the whip and spur of party well applied, it seems to me, is sufficient to account for any intelligent man's attempting the proof. Of course, I know that those who rely upon the gospel simply, as the power of God for salvation, are regarded by their opponents as heretics. And equally well do I know that not a knight of the added power is willing to categorically state, and publicly in a fair discussion affirm, what he calls me a heretic for denying. If in this I am mistaken, and there should be one worthy and

valiant enough to disappoint me, I should like to be advised of his local habitation and name. But is there another power? I do not believe it.

I.—The language of the passage quoted, considered in connection with the circumstances of its utterance, seems to me to be exclusive; that is, to exclude every other power than the one specifically included. This is certainly true, provided the translation is right. Every authority known to me seems to agree that the Greek, *dunamis gar theou estin*, should be rendered, "for it is the power of God."

If this be the true reading, and I believe it has not been questioned, it follows that the gospel is not simply a power, but it is *the* power of God for salvation. That is, it is the only, or at least the chief power. I have examined Clarke, Wesley, Macknight, Bengel, Olshausen, Chalmers, Bible Union, Anderson, and the King's version, and find that they all concur in the translation as above. Now the force of this collocation of words is to make it almost absolutely certain that no power other than the gospel is of God for salvation. Add to this the fact, that Paul must have had before his mind, that the Roman brethren wished the very question before us authoritatively settled, either for their own sakes, or to enable them the better to satisfy others, and the conclusion that he told the whole truth, and that there is therefore not another power, is, I think, necessary and certain. The fact that Paul declares the power that God employs when he saves a sinner, is held to be proof that he deemed an answer to the question before us necessary. And the fact that he does formally and distinctly answer the question, in view of a deep necessity, must be held as evidence *prima facie* that he told the whole truth. If he did tell the whole truth, it follows that there is no other power.

II.—It is fair to suppose that Jesus Christ did, in the commission to his ambassadors, give in charge all and singular the things necessary to be taught, believed, and done, in order to the sinner's salvation. To suppose that he did omit any one single item or element of truth or duty is to suppose a monstrous absurdity. Much more is it irrational to suppose that he did omit to mention the essential importance of seeking for and calling down the power of the Holy Ghost, something distinct from the gospel, in order to salvation. Now if we must allow, as we certainly must, that the Savior did specify in the commission everything that the apostles were to preach and to require of the sinner, and therefore everything that the sinner should believe and do in order to be saved, it follows that, unless he did charge the apostles to teach the people to seek for and expect this abstract power, the sinner should not now be so taught. It is not necessary to quote the different records of the commission,

in order to show that this power, which I have called added power, is not mentioned in any of them. The ordinary reader of the Bible knows that it is not there. The apostles were charged under circumstances the most solemn to preach the gospel, but they were not told to preach anything else. It seems to me to follow certainly that they were never authorized to preach anything else. What they were not authorized to do, it is very certain we are not. This conclusion gathers, if not strength, at least confirmation, from the fact that the apostles did never, in a single instance of a sinner's conversion, teach him to expect, seek, or wait for the added power. In view, then, of the commission and of the practice of the apostles, what shall we say of the conduct of parties in our day, who are constantly calling for power that is in addition to the power of God for salvation?

Meetings are advertised in the religious and secular papers, and large posters are set up, giving notice that all hands are invited in to bring down the Holy Ghost! These things are not done in a corner, nor in some oath-bound secret organization, that they should be kept secret; but they are done in the light of day, and are open to public criticism. For what are they done? For the conversion of the sinner. But why are they done? Because, manifestly, it is thought that there is another power for salvation besides the gospel. The power which the gracious Father says is his for the salvation of the sinner is deemed to be insufficient, and hence the cry for more. But little observation is needed to convince any one that the dependence is put mainly in the Holy Ghost, and but little, if any, in the gospel. Anciently, people did honor God with their lips while their hearts were far from him, but these dishonor God even with their lips.

Paul was determined to preach nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified, or the gospel, and I suppose the same to be true of the other apostles. (1 Cor. ii., 2.) Now it does seem to me to be certain, that since the Lord never commissioned the apostles to preach anything else, and never authorized them to require of the sinner to believe anything else, nor to expect another power besides the gospel, and since the apostles really never did preach anything else, then to teach or preach another power is to do exceedingly wrong.

The gospel that is now too often preached is, that after due trial the Holy Spirit will come down, move upon the deep of the sinner's heart and convert his soul, and that directly or immediately. This, announced to the sinner, is, if believed, glad tidings or gospel. And it is just as certainly another gospel from that which Paul preached as it is that Paul had no commission to preach such a gospel. Now in view of the fact that Paul declares in his letter to the Galatians (i., 8, 9), that if he or an angel from heaven should preach any other gospel he should be accursed; and since to preach any other power

is really the same thing as to preach another gospel, I conclude that it is wrong and dangerous to preach another power.

III.—If there be another power for salvation, it is either with or without conditions. In this connection let me say that I am not speaking of what may possibly be true. For what is only possibly true may possibly be false. And just as long as anything is possibly false it is not proved to be true, and is not therefore to be required or accepted as an article of faith by any one. Again : if there be conditions upon which the added power will come and do its work, they must be fixed and certain, for otherwise there are and can be no conditions. If, then, we are to believe in the added power, it must not only be certain that such a power is necessary to salvation, but the conditions of our enjoying the benefits of the power must be fixed and the result certain. If the power in question does come and operate upon the sinner without specific conditions, that is, unconditionally, then is the sinner entirely passive in the change produced, or, if active at all, he is blindly so ; he is not a voluntary intelligent agent. But in turning to God, the sinner is clearly and indisputably to act the part of an intelligent, voluntary, moral agent. It follows, then, that there is either no such power as that of which we speak for salvation, or that it does operate upon specific conditions. What, then, are the conditions of its operation ? Is the condition prayer, of either saint or sinner ? I deny that it is. There is certainly not a single statement of the word of God that teaches us that prayer is the condition upon which the converting power will come, will certainly come. If it be replied that it does sometimes come in answer to prayer, it is enough to say : It sometimes does not come. And since it sometimes does not come, and no one can deny it, it follows that prayer is not the condition of its coming, and that therefore there is no such power conditioned upon prayer. And God having never specified any conditions upon which he would "send down the converting power," to turn the sinner to God, should, in reason, be held as proof that there is no other power to be looked for or sought.

IV.—That there is no other power is argued from the fact that no other is needed. The principle upon which I base the reasoning is, that God does no unnecessary work. That the gospel is all that is necessary is argued from the following scriptures : "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." (Psalm xix., 7.) Here the Psalmist declares that the law was God's perfect instrument for converting the soul. The law being perfect for the purpose stated, an addition for that purpose was, of course, wrong, and hence God expressly forbade it. If it be said that conversions in David's time embraced less than they do now, I shall deny it. Conversions then concerned the whole man, soul, body, and spirit, as now. Not that

conversion always means so much ; but when considered in reference to the acceptable service of God, it never meant nor means less. I know it is said that the law could not "give life, in that it was weak," etc. Yet it was perfect, converting the soul. Now shall not the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, that makes free from the dominion of sin and death, possess as much power in its place as "the law" did in its place ? Shall it be reckoned less than perfect, for the purpose of freeing from the law of sin and death ? If not, then an addition is impossible, or there is no other power. "For in Christ Jesus have I begotten you through the gospel." (1 Cor. i., 15.) Here the apostle says distinctly that the Corinthians were by him begotten through the gospel ; that the gospel was the instrument used by him in their begetting. It is true that a person is not begotten in Christ Jesus, "of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God ;" still no explanation of this passage is right that will conflict with the fact that the Corinthians were begotten by the apostle Paul. They were, then, begotten by God, and also by the apostle Paul ; yet there were not two begettings. They were, then, begotten of God just as and when they were begotten by the apostle Paul, and not otherwise. So we here learn how the sinner is begotten. It is through the gospel. If it be asked : How can these things be ? the answer is plain : God gave the good seed of the kingdom, and the apostle Paul sowed them, and in good and honest hearts they took root and grew into life. God gave the instrument—the gospel, and the apostle preached it. Thus in the kingdom of heaven, as in the kingdom of nature, is the law of life a fixed one ; and in nothing is the goodness of God more manifest than it is in this. Thus the sinner may, if he will, be sure, without one sad, disheartening failure or temptation to skepticism, to find the pearl of great price. Never a mourner is left on the ground unblessed, a seeming proof that God is not willing or ready to be gracious. So I conclude that there is not another power, or at least that the presumption is so high, that ere we must believe that there is, the proof must be clear and to the point. I know very well that if another instrument of begetting were taught in the Holy Scriptures, we must believe it and so teach. But it is not so.

I deem the foregoing sufficiently suggestive and demonstrative for the present purpose, and shall now proceed to notice a few things thought to be in opposition to my view. "The Holy Spirit was poured out at Jerusalem on Pentecost, and therefore the work of salvation was wonderful. Three thousand were converted in one day." It is hence concluded that the direct power of the Spirit is brought to bear upon the sinner's heart in order to his conversion. Does the conclusion follow from the premises ? Avoiding every side issue, it is certain that the Spirit did not operate directly upon the sinners on

that occasion. Of such a fact there is not the slightest evidence. It is true that the conversions of Pentecost are to be placed to the credit of the Spirit. But we inquire not whether the Spirit does convert the sinner, but whether its converting power is in the gospel, or whether it converts as a power out of the gospel, as another power. The fact that the Spirit converted the pentecostans is certainly not proof that the Spirit operated directly upon them.

Nor is there in any fact or circumstance in the history of that occasion the smallest intimation that the Holy Spirit did operate immediately. On the contrary, it is declared emphatically that the Spirit did operate through the apostles; they spake only as the Spirit gave them utterance. Here, on the grand inauguration occasion, when the door of the kingdom was opened wide for the reception of every one who would believe and be immersed, we have an example of the mode in which the Spirit's power is brought to bear for salvation. The apostles spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance, and the Spirit spoke as God gave it to speak, for he spake not from himself. (John xvi., 13.) And thus when the apostles spoke, it was God and the Spirit that spoke. When the people heard the apostles, they heard God and the Spirit. When they were "cut to the heart," it was by the power of God and the Spirit. It is expressly stated that "when they heard this" (what Peter preached) "they were pierced to the heart." But Peter preached the gospel. It was, then, the gospel that they heard. But it was what they heard that pierced them to the heart. It was, then, the gospel that pierced them to the heart, and caused them to cry for salvation. Or, finally, the gospel proved on that occasion to be the power of God for salvation, and the circumstances taken together prove that there was not another power. At the forty-first verse we are told that "they that gladly received his word, or believed the gospel, were immersed, and were saved; for "he that believes and is immersed shall be saved." (Mark xvi., 16.) Notice, "they that received gladly his word," not that had got a hope or felt a change, were immersed. I submit, that if people would receive gladly or believe with all the heart the gospel now and be immersed they would be saved. Moreover, it is most strange, inexcusable, and mischievous, that teachers will teach and people will practice otherwise.

So far, then, is any fact or circumstance, that stands with the conversion of the three thousand, from proving that there was any direct or immediate power besides the gospel in operation, that the evidence is directly and unanswerably against such a supposition.

2. "Cornelius and his house were immersed in the Holy Spirit." It is inferred from this that the Holy Spirit is to come directly upon the sinner, in his saving power, in order to his conversion; or, that the Spirit's abstract power, if it have any, is essential to convert the

sinner. Here the premises furnish the fact simply that Cornelius and his house were immersed in the Holy Spirit, or that it fell on them, whereas the conclusion takes into account the end or purpose. The conclusion is void of any logical connection with the premises ; the whole is, therefore, a logical fallacy.

We have no right to suppose the outpouring on Cornelius' household to have been intended for any other purpose than the one which it is said to have served. Peter, the six brethren with him, and the whole church at Jerusalem, decided and declared at the time that the direct Spirit manifestations witnessed on the occasion were to convince Peter and all the Jews that the Gentiles were to be fellow-heirs with the Jews in the kingdom of God ; that God put no difference between them. Peter, it seems, was to that time a predestinarian ; he thought that God had special regard for the Jews, as Jews ; but now, and in the way above set forth, he is convinced "that God is no respecter of persons ; but that, in every nation, he that fears God and works righteousness is accepted of him."

On this occasion, as on all others, Peter preached to them the gospel ; they heard it ; were cut to the heart, or believed it with all their hearts, and were immersed. Here again we are led to believe that the gospel is the only power.

3. It is argued that the gospel is certainly not the only power of God to save ; else, says one : I would have been saved long since, for I have often heard and read it ; yet I am not saved. Let me answer this objection by asking : Does not the objection lie as fatally against every other theory as it does against mine ? Granting, for the present, that the fact that any given man is not saved is proof that the gospel is not able to save him, or that it must have some power added to it to make it efficient, will not the fact that the man is not saved prove as well that there is no power that can save him ? So universal damnation follows. The fact that the man is not saved is all that is in our premises. If it follow from this that the gospel is not the only power, it does certainly follow, also, that there is no adequate power for his salvation ; for he is not saved. Is it answered that it will not come unless the sinner will ask for it ? But will it certainly come, if he should ask for it ? It would without ever one single failure, if God employed such a power, and has conditioned its coming and working upon the sinner's asking for it. Here is an unsaved man ; hence this theory is false, for he does ask. But says the objector : The sinner must ask with his whole heart, then the power will come. This is, in fact, false, as I know from my own experience ; and others know it too, and so testify. Nor have the Holy Scriptures any such lessons in them. But it is said, perhaps, "that in every case where the power does not come the fault is in the sinner, he does not exercise faith, or he does not give himself up

entirely to God." I accept this conclusion : That if the sinner is not saved it is his fault ; and that the fact that the sinner is not saved is no proof, therefore, that the gospel is not the only power of God for salvation. The gospel does not save some, because they do not believe it ; and it is greatly to be feared that large numbers have been led to doubt the power of God—the gospel—from being taught that there is another power. It is not pretended that the gospel is of sufficient power to save one who does not believe it. Nay, there is no power great enough to save the man who will not believe. The gospel message is not in this respect peculiar. No message, whether brought by the winged spirit and delivered in soft small whispers to the soul, or by the apostles of Jesus Christ acting under a commission sealed by the Savior's blood—no message of interest, for time or eternity, can affect intelligently and savingly any sinner who does not believe it. So the fact that a sinner is not saved is not proof that the gospel is impotent to save, but only that the sinner does not believe. "It is the power of God for salvation to every one that believes." Thus is the objector's problem solved without its being necessary to suppose another power.

4. "The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God." Here the Spirit is represented as giving evidence that we are already in a certain state, but not that the Spirit is a power distinct from the gospel to bring us into such a state. Our question seeks to know God's power in order to salvation ; whereas, this text informs us only that the Spirit's testimony, with that of our own spirits, is the evidence by which we may know that we are already saved ; that is, the passage has no bearing upon our subject.

"For the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv., 12.) "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached to you."

I submit the foregoing, more deeply convinced than ever that the gospel is God's only power for salvation. No union that would leave one part of the body at the mourner's bench, calling for power, power, while the others are faithfully preaching the gospel, would do any good. A union that shall bless man and glorify God must be on the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. B.

INFANT SPRINKLING.—Combine and compute the force of all the causes now at work in Bible lands to keep men out of the kingdom of God, and infant rantism exceeds them all. It is the most disastrous invention of Satan since the introduction of sin.

THE TRUE WORSHIP OF GOD.

[And being asked by the Pharisees, when is the kingdom of God coming, he answered them and said: The kingdom of God is not coming with watching; nor shall they say, See here or there; for, lo, the kingdom of God is within you.—LUKE xvii.]

THAT the same Greek word should be uniformly rendered by the same English word, so long as practicable, is, as a principle of translation, justly held sacred by all real scholars. The principle, however, is not of universal application. But this grows out of the fact that in the Greek, as in all other languages, words often occur in more senses than one. We are hence required to apply the rule only in all cases where practicable. Accordingly we should, without doubt, retain the word kingdom in all cases where we can. But I much incline to think that the word reign would, in some instances, be the better word. For example, in the passage above, it would perhaps be better to say the reign of God is within you, than the kingdom of God is within. The word kingdom seems to apply more appropriately to something without us, to something material and visible, and hence to something incapable of being within us. Strictly speaking this may not be correct; but so we seem to feel. On the other hand, the word reign, denoting control by the will of another, would seem better suited to express whatever is within us. Whether, however, the distinction really exists, and therefore should be marked, is not here dogmatically said. The distinction is suggested, not decided.

But should we read, the kingdom of God is *within* you, or *among* you? I unhesitatingly answer, the former. The original is *entos*, the strongest word in the language to express the notion of being within or inside. The question does not admit even the semblance of doubt. We should hence translate, the reign of God is within you.

Christ's reign, therefore, has primary reference to the inner man, not to the outer. In other words, it is the spirit and not the body which is to be subject to his will. And this serving God in mind, or with the spirit, I denominate the true worship of God. All else is secondary and partial. This alone is primary, and possibly in a sense, and in certain cases, deserves to be called complete. At least, if to any service we can apply the term complete, it is to this.

When the Savior uttered this language, the time had fully come for the change which it implies. In the providence of God the necessity had matured, and at once the initial step is taken. All antecedent religions had had reference chiefly to the flesh; and if to the spirit they had spoken at all, they had spoken in language

shadowy and hieroglyphic, and hence understood by few, perhaps at the time by none. This, beyond all question, was right at the first. Sin was introduced into the world by a temptation addressing itself to the eye. "Eve *saw* the fruit that it was good for food." Had she not had eyes we have no evidence that Satan could ever have succeeded with that fruit. Whether he could have accomplished his end in some other way, we have no means of knowing; but through means of the inhibited fruit the presumption is he could not. Consequently, since sin began through the flesh, it seems proper that through the flesh an effort should have been made to redeem man. Through flesh came the ruin, let it now be tested whether through flesh can come the remedy.

Besides, had not religion at the first addressed itself to the flesh the world would never so readily have accepted one addressing itself to the spirit. We should always have felt that had the divine procedure been different, the results might have been better. Flesh and sense claim our first attention, and to what extent they control us under all circumstances need not be made a question here. We should have felt that religion, to be successful, must lay hold of these great controlling principles, and through them effect its objects. The conviction would have been that, by appealing to reason or the inner man, the heavenly Father had neglected the stronger, and availed himself of the weaker power in man to save him. Nor do I see how the case could have been otherwise. As a matter of fact, we know that flesh controls man more than reason. Naturally, then, we should have concluded that to the flesh the first appeal should be made. The result would have been that life with us would have been a perpetual murmur, and been spent in distrusts of the divine wisdom. All this God forestalled by the course he adopted. He did at the first precisely what man *a priori* would have asked him to do—address religion to the flesh rather than to the spirit. In all this God was working out one splendid conclusion; namely, that a religion of the flesh, though the very thing human nature clamors for, is the very thing to ruin it. This conclusion, it was necessary to work into the very soul of humanity by the most overwhelming experience before proceeding further; and this conclusion was thus worked in. By the procedure man has been left to see, what it appears he is still determined never to see, that a religion purely of the spirit is the only religion that can save him.

But how did God work this conclusion out, and render it obvious to all who desired to see it? This question will be best answered by considering the effects of a religion of the flesh in the human family. These effects are chiefly three.

1. To engender and foster pride. Of the truth of this, the universal history of religion is one mournful proof. Nor does it matter whether

the religion be true or false, the effect is the same. In the case of a true religion, however, this reservation is to be made, that the effect is not intended. In no case can God intend what is injurious to his creatures. Still, the effect follows, and not the less surely because not designed. It follows from the nature of that to which the religion relates—the flesh, and hence certainly. As a specific illustration of the truth of what is here said, I may cite the example of the Jews. Never since earth began was there so proud a people as were they in the days of their greatest prosperity. Other nations were looked on as dogs in comparison with themselves. Even the touch of a stranger polluted them, in their esteem. In their vanity they even felt that God was, in some special sense, their own. This swelled high their fleshly hearts. Indeed, there was nothing that belonged to them or pertained to them of which they were not proud. They were proud of their ancestry, and proud of their history ; proud of their laws, and proud of him through whom they had received them ; proud of their priests, and proud of their splendid ritual ; proud of the memory of the past, proud of the wilderness, proud of the manna, proud of the pillar of fire, proud of the victory of the Red Sea, proud of the Tabernacle, proud of its service, proud of their prophets, proud of their poets—proud, I repeat, of everything. Their glory, as they deemed it, and their shame were alike their pride. Such was the effect of a divine religion, severe and sternly just, on a people in no sense naturally worse than other people ; and this because it “ stood in meats and drinks and diverse washings, even *fleshly* ordinances.” Pre-eminently, in its most imposing features, was it a religion of the flesh ; hence the effect just amplified.

2. To multiply sin. This is another effect sure to happen under a religion pertaining to the flesh ; not necessarily, I grant, but still sure to happen “ Moreover,” says Paul, “ the law entered that the offense might abound.” The law, pertaining primarily to the flesh, and only in its deep typical sense to the spirit, entered that the offense or transgression might abound, and thus show what the flesh is when the subject of religion. Promote the pride of the human heart, and thereby you multiply the chances of sin. Pride must be gratified. This gratification it will seek both in lawful and unlawful ways. It is not the normal state of man. Its wants, therefore, for the most part are unnatural and criminal. But these wants it will satisfy, and thus sin increases. Besides, pride is a state of perpetual excitement. Under its influence the system is constantly kept strung up too high. Chafing and irritation are easy here ; and these again lead to sin. Restraints, moreover, become intolerable. Pride will break them. Right is thus disregarded, and crime ensues. But pride itself is sin, and God is against it. It is hence doubly wrong, wrong in itself, and leading to wrong.

3. It induces blindness. A religion of the flesh not only produces pride, but also selfishness. A proud man thinks himself better than his neighbors. He hence feels that something is due him which is not due them. Not only does he feel that he must live wholly for himself; he feels that others also should live for him. This is the very essence of selfishness. He hence grows exacting and ungenerous. This blinds him to the wants of others and to his obligations. As a result, he is true to neither. The selfish man is never clear-sighted in questions which involve the rights of others. By him justice is bribed, and never keeps her balances level. A right decision robs him, and he hence fears it. He is never to be trusted. Give him the chance, and he either cheats his soul or cheats his neighbor. But of all the things that blind him, give the foremost rank to his religious pride. It blinds him to defects in his own creed, and blinds him to excellences in the creed of his neighbor. Indeed, he sees little good in man except in himself, no good in any creed except his own. He is supremely selfish, supremely proud, supremely bigoted, and supremely silly. Blindness promoted by their religion, or rather by their abuses of it, so blinded the minds of the Jews that they saw not in Jesus their long-expected Christ. What blindness did for them, it is doing for countless thousands now. These see the true religion of Christ only in their traditionary heresies, and heresy only in the true religion of Christ. For this blindness there is no cure. Men die in it and are lost. This is its end.

And just here emerges the danger to Christianity. Man naturally delights in a religion which ministers to the flesh, ministers to its pride, its love of show, its love of ease. Hence, in all ages since its origin he has been repeating efforts to carnalize Christianity. In Roman Catholicism his success has been complete. Here few restraints are imposed upon the flesh, save in the case of the humble toilers whose industry is necessary to the support of privileged superiors; while in these the flesh is pampered in every way which human cunning can devise. In the flesh and its lusts, Christianity has its worst human foe. As in time past its corruptions issued from this source, so will it be in time to come. Let us hedge against the lusts of the flesh, and all is safe; let us not, and all is lost.

Here, my brethren, let us pause and take an account. Stand we fast, and do no perils threaten? "Watchmen, what of the night?" Comes there up to the surface no sign of restlessness, none of discontent? See we no indication of relaxing the rigor of the ancient discipline? I wish it were in my power to answer these questions exultingly with an emphatic no; but it is not. While, for the most part, all goes well, I see a speck above the horizon which augurs evil. An ill-omened bird sits on a smitten tree, and troubles me with her note. "To arms," she croaks, "the foemen storm the wall." I repent, then, let us take an account.

Do not deem me timid when I tell you that men stand among us, not with us, who are seeking at the moment while I am uttering this to popularize the gospel. These men are not satisfied with the primitive order of things. They love the uppermost seats at feasts, and delight in new things. The simple discipline of the church is not enough for them. They would like to be tried only by their peers. A council of clergymen would suit them better. Baptism for the remission of sins is offensive to them. They do not believe it. They extol the parties of the day, and covet the honors of orthodoxy. Their brethren they do not like; sectarians they fondly love. A creed would be no shock to them; and they delight in the tones of an organ. The solution of all this is easy. Christianity is a severe religion of the spirit. To the flesh it allows nothing but servitude. It is intolerant of error and lust. It is hence oppression, and must be thrown off or modified. We live in a progressive age. Old things suit not us. The gospel in which fishermen delighted needs reconstructing. It must be softened a little. It is too stern and must be humanized. It needs adjusting to the world, to be made agreeable to its tastes; and this work on a small scale is now in its incipency. The old grand spirit of the early champions of the primitive gospel is relaxing. There is a dangerous yielding to earthly and fleshly vanities, which, if not checked, will prove disastrous. Church fairs, bazaars, and picnics are now looked upon by many brethren with an exceedingly lenient eye. Social dancing is feebly opposed by some, while by others it is openly advocated. It is now perilous for a preacher to breathe its name in disapprobation. It must be winked at, at least, or he is politely requested to resign. These things must be opposed. Every man among us must stand nobly up for the following position: *In all acts of worship we must do only what is prescribed in the New Testament, or was done with divine sanction by the primitive Christians.* Not the semblance of innovation must be allowed on this sacred principle. This will exclude the offensive and dangerous practices just named; and the sooner it is known that they are intolerable in the churches of Christ, the better. But a few hints, and not an amplification, are all that I designed.

By first addressing religion to the flesh, God wrought out another great result—that human flesh, while sin is in it, is not improvable. Be not startled, my brethren, but the flesh never grows better. It is as lawless at the moment of death as at the moment of birth, and this in the saint as in the sinner. We may bit and rein it, may hold it in check, or keep it under, but we never improve it. Paul's flesh, at the moment when writing "I have fought the fight," was not one whit better than mine, nor better than even his own when breathing out threatenings against the disciples. He "kept his body under," but it never grew better; and he himself tells us that in his flesh dwelt "no

good thing." This is strong ; but, according to every Christian man's experience, not too strong. By disuse, the flesh and fleshly appetites may be weakened, but that never ceases to be lawless, nor these to clamor for gratification. Still, in simple disuse, we have our only remedy against them. Deny them the food they seek ; you can do no more.

And herein, by the way, lies the philosophy of fasting. It is not, as many would seem to think, the mere arbitrary imposition of a hardship. Very far from it. It has a deep significance for the Christian. It is to be to him a discipline, the object of which is *the control of his flesh*. For the presumption is that he who can wholly abstain from food and drink can be master of himself in all other respects. This mastery is the object of fasting.

But now, what conclusions do the preceding premises warrant ? They are meagre, I grant ; still they are enough for my purpose. Clearly, then, they warrant the following conclusions :

1. *The solemn obligation to maintain the simplicity of the gospel.* It is not enough that we keep it simple for the sinner ; we must keep it simple for ourselves. An elaborate and showy religion is precisely the religion in which the flesh rejoices. Give the flesh forms, give it ceremonies, give it pageant—these are its delight. But these are not the characteristics of Christianity. They are its corruptions. The sinner, who smites on his breast, and in the anguish of his heart cries, What must I do to be saved ? is in no mood to be amused with long recitals of ceremonies. An answer brief, pertinent, and intelligible is what he seeks. This the gospel provides for him ; it is hence his right, and he is robbed of Heaven's highest blessing when it is withheld from him. With holy emphasis, then, I repeat, keep the gospel simple for the sinner. Insist with all the vehemence of one standing on the margin of the pit, and warning against it ; insist that faith, use no epithet, that repentance, use no epithet, and immersion, use no epithet—that these, in all cases where the Bible is, are Christ's own appointed conditions of remission of sins. Admit no exceptions, nor give any license to disobedience. These conditions proclaim, in a bold, manful spirit ; proclaim them without apology, without stint. With them we have fought the fight, with them gained the victory. By them now, let us bravely stand.

But we must keep the gospel pure for ourselves. Hence every semblance of show and parade, not demanded by the severest construction of its provisions, must be withstood. For the sake of the holy joy caused by giving, for the sake of the deep gratitude awakened by beneficence, let us squander no funds uselessly on fine churches. Let these, with all their appointments, be severely simple. Thus shall we save large sums for deeds of charity.

2. That apostasy takes its rise in the flesh. Between flesh and

spirit under Christ there is a never-ending antagonism. The one is forever at war against the other. The spirit is completely subject to the will of Christ ; the flesh is the very reverse. This keeps up an endless strife. The soul is thereby harassed and fretted. Of this, in the course of time, it becomes weary. It now finds it easier to yield than to resist. In yielding, moreover, it exchanges a present restraint for a present pleasure. The temptation to do this is often hard to resist. Indeed, too often it is not resisted at all ; and when once the spirit begins to yield to the flesh, the work of ruin goes rapidly on. This work looks to two ends—the removal of restraints, and worldly gratifications. On both these I must dwell a little.

The most difficult task assigned the Christian, in the present state, is that of duly restraining the flesh. The wants of the spirit are few ; the wants of the flesh countless. In regard to those, the Christian soon learns that no full provision has been made to meet them in this life. Whether this can not be, or should not, it is needless to inquire. We know it to be so. The gratification of the spirit is something to be looked for in a state beyond this. But as to the wants of the flesh, the case is the very reverse. For these the future state makes no provision. The present alone is left to them. If not here and now gratified, they never will be. Besides, their gratification is mostly attended with highly intoxicating present pleasure. The opportunity for this once lost may never return. How hard, under these circumstances, is the task of fleshly denial ? But this denial the gospel imposes as a most solemn duty. Hence the wants of the flesh and the restraints of the gospel stand always strongly opposed. To bear these restraints is in itself not agreeable ; while not to gratify those wants is very hard. The temptation, therefore, to throw off the restraints is double. Few men are proof against this pressure. All are ready to yield to it more or less ; many, wholly. Thus the tendency constantly is to fleshly victory and spiritual bondage. Such is the Christian's strife. But already I have mentioned the work of ruin, when once the spirit begins to yield to the flesh, as looking likewise to worldly gratifications. By these I mean such gratifications as the man of the world delights in, or as the unregenerate heart seeks. These Christ denies to his followers. Of course, I speak not of those fleshly gratifications which, being kept within proper limits, are lawful. I speak only of those which are wrong in themselves, or are wrong from their evil tendencies. Boldly the Christian must withstand these. To yield to them even once may prove fatal. Persistent, obstinate resistance alone is safe ; for when once the soul's firm resolution to resist is broken, life is half wrecked. A broken will against evil is more to be lamented than all the mere temporal disasters which can befall man. Here it is, moreover, that the danger of sensual pleasure comes out. It endows the flesh with the control over

the spirit. Where this is complete there is positively no hope. It must hence be resolutely withstood, especially in its incipient stages. When far advanced, the chances of successful opposition become few and feeble. Subdue the flesh in the very outset of the Christian life, otherwise it is almost certain to triumph till death. It must be kept constantly under. Hence all attempts to make Christianity minister to it are both criminal and dangerous, and must hence, by the true disciple of Christ, be disused. Great temples, therefore, as places of worship, with gorgeous appurtenances which feed only the lust of the eye, together with the select voluptuous music of organs and hired choirs, which excites only the languid carnal emotions of the heart, are to be reprobated and utterly shunned. Better that the cause of Christ should never again be advocated beneath a roof constructed by human hands, and that another note of cultivated music should never be heard, than that it should be enfeebled by these things, and its power of control thereby weakened. At best, it is not too certain that the flesh will be kept under ; at worst, it is certain not to be.

But the necessity for the change implied in the Savior's language, upon which I am now commenting, will become still more apparent by considering the difference between the Christian man and the sinner. Wherein, then, consists the great material distinction between them ? The Christian man is a man whose mind is controlled by the will of Christ, and whose body is controlled by his mind. The man of the world is a man whose body Satan controls, and whose mind is controlled by his body. In other words, Christ controls the mind, and the mind the body—this makes the Christian. Satan controls the body, and the body the mind—this makes the sinner. Herein lie all the differences, partial and complete, between the two. Hence, whatever ministers superfluously to the flesh, as flesh, helps Satan ; while, on the contrary, whatever ministers to the spirit, enlightening and strengthening it, helps Christ. Surely in view of this no Christian man can get his consent to work merely for the flesh.

From this, moreover, it can be still more clearly seen how it is that a religion of the flesh tends rather to ruin man than to save him. Such a religion by ministering directly to the flesh greatly strengthens it. Of this increased strength Satan avails himself to subjugate still further the spirit. Besides, increasing the power of the flesh relatively diminishes that of the spirit. As that grows stronger, this becomes the less adequate to the task of controlling it. This is another advantage to Satan. Just as he perceives the controlling power of the spirit decreasing, his exertions are redoubled to gain the complete mastery over it. For with the Christian man when this is once done, the case is about hopeless. This end, therefore, gained, and Satan feels that he can rest easy, as his work is about done. In the case of too many, indeed, it must be pronounced effectually done, since from it no recovery ever takes place.

All the antecedent religions to Christianity sought to control man by acting upon him from without, inwardly. They hence failed. Christianity reverses the order of procedure, or the direction in which the force acts. It seeks to control man by acting upon him from within, outwardly. Its seat is the spirit. From this, as from a centre, its power radiates. Christ seeks the mastery of the soul; the devil that of the flesh. The true worshipers are they who worship God in spirit and in truth. The spirit is the fountain whence the worship springs; the truth is the law which regulates it. This marks the great radical difference between Christianity and all other religions. Christ begins his work in the spirit among the very springs and roots of life itself. Here he seeks to establish his supremacy, here to inaugurate and carry on his reign. It is within a man, over his spirit, that he rules.

First give Christ the complete control of the mind, then comes the case of the body. This, not Christ directly, but the mind itself controls. "I," said Paul, "keep my body under." It was the true Paul, the inner man, the spirit or mind which did this. It was not the Savior; for otherwise it would be difficult to account for its being incomplete. And what Paul here says of himself is true of every other saint. Each keeps his body under. The work of subduing the flesh is left with the Christian. If not done by him it will go undone. The task is difficult indeed; and is never attended with complete success. But so important is the dependent result that the most heroic effort should be made to accomplish it. Here, as elsewhere, God requires perfection. He can not require less, though he knows he will never realize it. To do so would be so far to license imperfection. This he can not do. His plan is sternly to require a perfect life—perfect in spirit, perfect in flesh, and to forgive the deficiencies. This is better than to require a life only partly correct. It is better to forgive sin than to license it.

Previously in this piece it was suggested that the service of God in spirit might in certain cases be perfect. The present seems the place to amplify that suggestion. It doubtless struck the reader as novel, and perhaps as false. Certainly it needs qualification. By the expression, it was not meant that any man while in the flesh ever attains a state of sinless perfection. No such state is attainable. But it was meant that the devotion of the spirit may be unbroken to the end of life. Paul says, "with the mind I serve the law of God." This is the service of which I speak; and I hold that it not only is continuous through life in many cases, but that in all it must be, if eternal life is attained. In the case of the true Christian, the mind in its fealty to Christ now relaxes. In its attachment and intent it is permanently true. In these it varies not. The Christian need only consult his own consciousness to find the verification of this.

He knows it to be true. That is, he knows that it never occurred that in spirit he gave Christ up and let him go. From the instant of his becoming a Christian down to the reading of this, there has never been a break in his faith, nor one in his attachment. Not only has he purposed to be true to Christ; he knows that in will he has actually been so. This is the highest and best service. When a man in the whole breadth of his will is held in obedience to Christ, he can rise no higher while in the flesh. All his other service will be unsteady and full of breaks. Failures will be constantly occurring. These will give him keen recurring pain. His pleasure will spring from the devotion of his mind. In this he will find his delight, and not in the acts in which the flesh can play a part. In all these, imperfection will be found. Nothing here is faultless. Sin is constantly emerging. Hence, when the Christian, in cases where the flesh is involved, has done his best, his comment must be—an unprofitable servant.

Not only is the real Christian constantly true to God in his spirit; but he can not be otherwise. If he fail here, in my candid judgment, he is lost, and lost forever. When his faith parts, his case is hopeless. This is the fatal "falling away" of Paul. After this, renewal to repentance never takes place; that is, the apostate can never be brought to repent a second time. He is gone, forever gone. When a man in his soul gives up Christ, lets him go, and ceases absolutely to believe in him, there is no more chance for his salvation than for that of Satan. It is a mockery to pray for him, or over him, or even to seem to hope for him. He has now counted the blood of Christ an unholy thing, and trampled it under his feet. He is consequently left without remedy and without hope. Certainly it is to be hoped that few such cases occur; but so frightful are they in their end, that no effort should be spared to prevent them. Hence the care that should be taken to check apostasy in its beginning. It may rapidly run to the wrecking of faith; then all is over.

On the contrary, so long as a man remains true to Christ in faith and will, it is difficult to say how numerous and how great his departures must become before his case is to be pronounced hopeless. It is questionable whether it ever can so become. Not that he is to be licensed to sin, nor not put away if he do not desist; but only that it is difficult to determine when he crosses the line beyond which hope reaches not. Unless I read the spirit of Christianity amiss, God looks into the soul for faith and purpose, rather than into the outer life for excellency. It is the inner state more than the outward record which avails with him. That, he will have right; this, he would. Hence, in all our dealings with the erring children of God, while we are to be most careful to show

no countenance to sin, we should be slow to decide them lost, while the will and faith still remain unbroken and entire. Aided by these we may save, but without them it is worse than idle to parley even a moment. When they have failed, instantly exclude.

Here I must again advert to the warfare which, in the case of the Christian, is perpetually going on between the flesh and the spirit. This I do for the mental relief of brethren whom the fact often troubles. When they have made their best effort to master the evil inclinations of the flesh, they find they have not succeeded. The flesh is still flesh ; and its appetites and propensities remain unsubdued. Brethren become alarmed at the fact, and begin to question the reality of their conversion. For this not the slightest necessity exists. The test of conversion is not the extinction of all fleshly desires. To the spirit, and not to the flesh, we must look in determining this question. Is the faith in Christ real, also the will strong to forsake sin and live a pure life ?—these, not absence of fleshly feeling, are the proof and the fact of conversion. Hence, where they are, no fear need be felt as to the soundness of the conversion. As already stated in this article, the flesh never grows better. The most we can do is to deny it the gratification it seeks. In this way we may curb it, and thereby diminish somewhat its controlling power. But the sinful propensities will forever remain. They are never extinguished. Gradually, by culture of the spirit, they grow more quiet ; but they are asleep, not dead. Give them but half a chance, and they are wild again in lawless revels. Let the Christian, then, not be alarmed at the fact that after conversion he still finds himself in the body, and with the flesh serving the law of sin. Only let him be constant in his purpose to serve God in spirit truly and always ; and with heroic will let him deny the flesh, if in his power, even one twitch of gratification. This will require sleepless vigilance. Moreover, it is endless. But it must be done ; otherwise all is lost.

Another important fact here presents itself, which finds its explanation in the views now in hand. When sinners are appealed to, to obey the gospel, they at once, where deeply concerned, set about the task of self-examination. They desire to determine beforehand, if possible, the probabilities of success should they take the solemn step. They now look closely into their hearts. They know they believe, they know they are penitent ; they know they love Christ and want to obey him. Here they have not a doubt. But they also feel that they are still in the flesh, and that its power over them is not yet wholly broken. They now erroneously conclude, because this is the case, that they are not fit to take the step ; and deem that they must further wait till these evil fleshly propensities have died within them. They hence decline to act. But this is not correct. The preacher must now be faithful and careful to explain the matter

to them. Let them know that these fleshly propensities never will leave them ; and that all they can do is to watch them and keep them subdued ; that faith in Christ, and not a change in flesh, is the ground on which he is to be obeyed. Great good will result from the procedure. I verily believe that to-day some of the best men in the land are kept out of the church by the very cause here named. Let preachers see that the obstacle is removed, and the correct view presented. Neither in the saint nor in the sinner does any change ever take place in the flesh. This great truth once fully known, and Satan's power, first, to keep men out of the church, and, second, to trouble them when in it, is much weakened.

"JESUS WEPT."—In the life of Jesus, as recorded for us by the Spirit, there are two weepings. Twice in the body and on the earth the man Jesus Christ shed tears ; but in neither case were they shed for himself. Not in Gethsemane, not on the cross, did Jesus weep. Both the sorrows were for our sakes ; but they differed widely from each other. When he drew near Jerusalem and beheld the city, he wept over it ; when he saw a bereaved sister mourning for a dead brother, he wept with her. The one weeping was for human guilt ; the other was for human sorrow. The one marks his divine compassion for the sinful ; the other his human sympathy with the sufferer. Each is precious in its own place, but the places are widely diverse. The two examples exhibit different qualities of the Savior, and meet different necessities of men. His compassion for sinners, manifested in his tears over Jerusalem, is a link in the chain by which we are saved, but it is an upper link ; his sorrow with a sister beside a brother's grave is a link lower down, and therefore nearer us. His pity for me as a sinner shows that he is great and good ; his weeping with me shows that his greatness and goodness are within my reach. When I could not arise to meet him in the region of his own spiritual compassion, he has bowed down to meet me in my natural weakness. I could not rise to lay hold of him, but he bends to take hold of me. Standing where I stand, and weeping where I weep, he enters by the openings which grief has made into my heart, and gently makes it all his own. My brother, he insinuates himself into me through the emotion of our common nature, that so I may be borne up with him into the regions of spiritual light and liberty. He takes hold of me by my sorrow, that I may get hold of him for deliverance from my sin.—*W. Arnot.*

DR. BROADDUS ON BAPTISM FOR REMISSION OF SINS.

THERE are few, if any, Baptist preachers in the United States of higher reputation for scholarship than Dr. John A. Broaddus, of the Theological Seminary at Greenville, in South Carolina. He has recently contributed a series of articles to the columns of the *Religious Herald*, conducted by Dr. J. B. Jeter, on the merits of the new version by the American Bible Union. In one of these he treats of "The Prepositions used with Baptize," and makes it the occasion of the most ingenious, and at the same time the most candid, argument against baptism for remission of sins that has come under my eye at any time. This is the most vital question at issue between the Baptists and the Disciples, and until it is settled there is no probability of either union or fraternal co-operation between them. They must become convinced that we are right on this subject, or we that they are right, before full fraternity can exist. The question can not therefore be ignored, but the issue must be fought out till a coming generation shall find it a settled question. It is gratifying to see men of learning and candor take hold of the question; for by them alone can the real merits of the argument *pro* and *con* be exhibited. The readers of the *Quarterly* will therefore feel gratified that I lay the article of Dr. Broaddus before them, and invite them to examine it very carefully.

"For the Religious Herald.

"THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

"THE PREPOSITIONS USED WITH BAPTIZE.

"In considering the changes made by the revisers in rendering the prepositions used with baptize, the following passages remain, which it is convenient to put together.

"Matt. iii., 11: 'I indeed baptize you with water (revised version, 'in water') unto repentance.' Mark i., 4: 'John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' Revised version, 'unto remission of sins.' (Likewise Luke iii., 3.) Acts ii., 38: 'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.' Revised version: 'Repent, and be each of you immersed, upon the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins.'

"It is certainly an improvement that the preposition (*eis*) should be in all these passages translated by the same word, unto. And this word comes nearer than any other to expressing the various senses which the Greek preposition (with its case) may in such

phrases convey. The preposition, strictly speaking, has the same force in these expressions that it has everywhere else, viz., that an object comes, or is brought, to be in, within, some other object or state. In Greek, the accusative case helps to express this. In English, having lost the case, we help ourselves by saying to in, or into. When used with some noun which does not denote a locality, but is figurative, expressing an ideal state, relation, etc., still *eis* has the same force, signifying that a person, or an action, is, as it were, brought and put within the limits of this noun, restricted to this state, relation, or object. From the very nature of the idea thus denoted, this form of expression will be most commonly applied to nouns expressing aim, design, result, and the like. But it is not always so. Thus in Acts xxv., 20, Festus says: 'And I, being perplexed in regard to (*eis*) the dispute about these things,' etc. His perplexity is described as, so to speak, brought and put within the limits of the dispute about these matters, an idea which we express by such phrases as 'with reference to,' 'regarding,' etc. In Matt. xii., 41, Jesus says of the Ninevites that 'they repented at (*eis*) the preaching of Jonah.' Their repenting is, as it were, put within the limits of the preaching of Jonah, especially referring to that. But in what more precise sense? From the natural relations between repenting and preaching, it would be almost impossible to suppose that some persons repented in order that another man might preach. We could hardly imagine it to mean anything else than that they repented with reference to his preaching as the occasion, very well expressed in English by at. And when we look to the known facts of history, it becomes certain that such was the case, and such must be the meaning.

"How, then, are we to decide, in any such use of *eis* with some noun expressing a figurative state, relation, etc., what is the more precise idea intended to be conveyed? In three ways. First, from the natural relations existing between the person or action in question and the something to which it is thus restricted. Second, from the connection in which the statement stands, or the facts of the case as known from other sources. Third, when the subject-matter is theological, we must, of course, look also to the general teachings of Scripture, and ask which of the possible relations between this person or action and this noun is in accordance with the general teachings of Scripture on the subject involved. This last is but one application of the well-known rule that the meaning of doubtful or indefinite passages is to be determined by a regard to the general teaching of the Bible.

"Now take the passage, 'I indeed baptize you in water unto (*eis*) repentance.' As to the natural relations between the things, it is altogether possible, to a mind inclined to ritualism, to suppose that baptism should be performed in order that men might repent, as a

means of inducing them, or pledging them, to repent. But the facts of the case are here conclusive. John required men to repent, required a profession that they did repent, before he would baptize them. And it is more according to the general teachings of Scripture, as evangelical Christians understand it, to think that a ceremony was to be the method of avowing repentance than the means of securing it. When this is met by translating *metanoia*, not repentance, but reformation, we have only to say that such is not its meaning. Dr. George Campbell wished to get away from the common error that repentance is merely sorrow, and he went into the opposite extreme. This could be easily proven, but it is supposed that no man well acquainted with Greek would now question it. So when John speaks of his baptizing as performed *eis*, that is, within the limits of repentance, the most common use of the preposition would lead us, at first sight, to suspect that repentance was presented as the end in view, the design, of the baptism; the natural relations between the two would admit of this as possible; but the facts of the case, as gathered from the connection and the general teachings of Scripture on the subject, lead us strongly to prefer the other possible relation, viz., that the baptizing referred to their repentance as its ground or reason.

"Again: take the phrase, 'baptize * * * unto remission of sins,' as above in Mark, Luke, Acts. The baptizing is described as, so to speak, brought and put within the limits of the remission of sins, specially confined to remission of sins. In what more precise sense? We should at first expect, because that is the more common use of *eis* with figurative nouns, that it would be in the sense of design or aim, in order to remission of sins. As to the natural relations between baptizing and remission of sins, such a thing is possible, and indeed very much in accordance with the general disposition of man, in every age, to make the spiritual depend on the external. Looking to the connection in which the statements are found, we find nothing to settle the question. We notice, to be sure, that it is not simply 'baptize * * * unto remission,' but in every case repentance is mentioned also, 'the baptism of repentance * * * unto remission,' 'repent, and be baptized * * * unto remission;' yet this is not conclusive against the interpretation stated, because the grammatical construction more naturally connects 'unto remission' with baptism or baptize, than with that and repentance or repent also. When we turn to our remaining means of determining, viz., the general teachings of Scripture, we find these decidedly and positively opposed to the idea that baptism should be the means of securing remission of sins, cutting at the root, as that idea would, of Paul's great and favorite doctrine that justification, which includes remission, proceeds from faith, apart from works of law.

"Grant, then, that to understand 'unto remission,' as in order to remission, would be following the most common use of the preposition; grant that it gives a perfectly possible sense, and one which mankind will readily adopt; yet, if such a view would bring us into direct conflict with the general teachings of Scripture on the subject, we must abandon it, if there be any other possible and natural relation between baptism and remission which is not liable to this fatal objection. Two such explanations are possible and appropriate. First, we may understand as in 'repented *eis* the preaching of Jonah,' 'baptize *eis* repentance,' that 'baptize *eis* remission of sins' presents this as the ground or reason of the baptism. This is a less common sense of *eis* and the accusative, but it is an actual one, absolutely necessary in the first of the passages just quoted, and greatly the most appropriate in the other, and sustained by additional usage, as intimated above. Second, we may understand 'unto remission,' as connected in the construction with repentance as well as baptism, and that remission of sins is the aim or design, not strictly of the baptism, but of repentance, which it is commanded and expected shall be indicated and avowed by baptism. This view would correspond to the natural and common explanation of 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' The second interpretation has the advantage of retaining the more common use of *eis*, and the disadvantage of connecting 'repentance' and 'repent' with 'unto remission,' which is perfectly possible, but, as already remarked, less natural to the grammatical construction; also of explaining that the baptism itself only represents or declares what it is really the repentance that secures; this, however, in a way parallel to the meaning of the commission.

"As to the choice between the first and second interpretations, Baptists are divided, and are likely to be, seeing that each view has advantages and disadvantages. A similar divergence of opinion exists with regard to 'born of water and the Spirit, where, setting aside as unscriptural the ritualistic view, which makes baptism absolutely indispensable to salvation, some of us hold that there is in the passage no reference to baptism at all, while others understand 'born of water' as meaning baptism, but at once proceed to show that this does not make baptism an invariable and indispensable condition of salvation. Upon the choice between two methods of interpretation we may consent to disagree, when the practical conclusion reached is the same.

"When speaking to truly devout persons, who hold that in the above passages 'unto remission' signifies 'in order to remission,' and who infer that there is no remission of sins until one is baptized, I should beg them to consider whether it is not dangerous and wrong to build a huge inverted pyramid of doctrine upon the merely pre-

ferred interpretation of two or three passages, while in direct conflict with the general tenor of Scripture. The whole fabric of Campbellism rests upon these passages ; and it must be shown, not merely that they may mean what is claimed by its advocates, but that they must have that meaning, or the structure has no solid foundation. That this can not possibly be shown is certain to my own convictions, and I trust has been made tolerably plain by the above imperfect statement.

"I repeat that the adoption by the revisers of unto throughout these passages is a decided improvement. Unto is probably derived from on to, and in Anglo-Saxon on was frequently interchanged with in. At any rate, unto is now quite commonly a better rendering of *eis* than into, where the noun has not a local, but a figurative sense. Other instances of it occurred in the article of last week.

" *Greenville, S. C.*

J. A. B."

It will be observed that in this article the writer sets out by heartily indorsing the renderings of the preposition *eis* which appear in the Bible Union version. These are, specially : "I indeed immerse you in water unto repentance ;" "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the immersion of repentance unto remission of sins ;" "Repent, and be each of you immersed, upon the name of Jesus Christ, unto remission of sins." The writer declares : "It is certainly an improvement that the preposition (*eis*) should be in all these passages translated by the same word, unto." He does not seem here to have weighed very accurately the force of the term which he so highly approves. In the last paragraph of his article he endeavors to express the exact force of unto, and says it was probably derived from on to. It is more likely that the prefix *un* has here its usual significance of not, as in unnatural, uncommon, etc. ; and when prefixed to the preposition to, indicated an approach near to, but not quite to, an object. But waiving this, as immaterial to the present issue, and taking the criticism given as the correct one, we proceed to inquire whether it really suits the purpose of Dr. Broaddus as well as he seems to think. If the meaning of the preposition is on to, then the action of the verb preceding it must of necessity bring its subject on to the object. It is not on the object before the action ; it is on it after the action, and it is brought on to its object by the action of the verb. In the case in hand, baptism is the action, and remission of sins is the object, while penitent believers are the subjects of the action. Now if the penitent believers are baptized on to remission of sins, they were not on it before baptism, but it is the baptism which brought them on to it. The baptism takes place first, and the remission of sins is the point gained by the baptism, the platform on to which baptism elevates us. Nothing can be clearer than this. Yet this is precisely what the Disciples teach, and precisely what the Baptists do not teach, and what Dr. Broaddus does not believe.

If, now, we take the other, and what I conceive to be the more probable meaning of unto, baptism unto remission would bring its subject close up to the enjoyment of that blessing, but not into it. It would leave remission of sins still unattained, after the baptism had been performed, instead of throwing it back, as the Doctor evidently desires, to a period antecedent to the baptism.

Such is the force of the chosen term unto, not only as it appears to the critical eye, but as it must forever appear to the eye of the common reader. So long as the common reader's Bible declares that we are baptized unto remission of sins, so long must he feel, in spite of all learned explanation to the contrary, that baptism brings him to remission. There is far less ambiguity in this term than there is in the preposition for; it expresses the thought for which we contend almost to precision, while it is entirely irreconcilable with the interpretation adopted by the Baptists. The chief objection to it is the fact that it is unquestionably obsolete. Webster says of it: "It is not in our mother tongue, nor is it used in popular discourse, or in modern writings. It is therefore to be rejected as obsolete and not legitimate." How the authors of the Bible Union version could reconcile it with one of their own rules of translation, which requires the ideas of the Scriptures to be expressed in the language of the present day, it is difficult to see; and how so discriminating a scholar as Dr. Broadbush should approve it I can account for only upon the well-known disposition of men to jump eagerly after any refuge from great distress and pain; for sure I am that every man who denies that baptism to a penitent believer is in order to remission of sins must very often feel seriously pained by the expressions on the subject which appear in the common translation.

We next call attention to the Doctor's effort to state the exact force of the Greek preposition *eis*, of which unto is, in his estimation, so happy a translation. He says: "The preposition, strictly speaking, has the same force in these expressions that it has everywhere else; viz., that an object comes, or is brought to be in, within, some other object or state." Here again the Doctor is unfortunate; for this definition is as far from suiting his purpose as the definition of unto. For if the preposition *eis*, in the expression "be baptized *eis* remission of sins," means that the object or subject baptized "comes, or is brought to be in, or within" the state represented by remission of sins, then again we have all taught that we ask. The party baptized is in, or within the enjoyment of remission, and it is his baptism that brought him within the enjoyment of this blessing. Nothing could suit us better. But the Doctor is a little loose in the application of his own definitions. In applying this one he uses this language: "Again, take the phrase, 'baptize * * * unto remission of sins,' as above in Mark, Luke, Acts. The baptizing is described as; so to speak, brought and

put within the limits of the remission of sins, specially confined to remission of sins." There is something a little strange about this sentence. Why those ominous * * * between "baptized" and "unto remission?" Was the Doctor afraid to let the object of that transitive verb baptize show itself, and must he hide it with three little * * * ? If the noun men, or the pronoun you, had been in there it would not have been so easy for the Doctor to say, "the baptizing is described as brought and put within the limits of the remission of sins;" it would, on the other hand, have been too apparent that, according to his own definition, the men or persons baptized were described as being brought and put within the limits of remission of sins. This is what his definition certainly requires; for it declares the force of the preposition to be, "that an object comes, or is brought, to be in, within, some other object or state." Now the person baptized, in this case, is the object, being the grammatical object of the verb baptize; hence, to make the sentence just quoted harmonize with the definition, it should read thus: "Again, take the phrase, 'Baptize * * * unto remission of sins, as above in Mark, Luke, Acts. The person baptized is described as, so to speak, brought and put within the limits of the remission of sins.' Of course, he is brought and put there by baptism; for there is no other action mentioned in the case; and thus again the Doctor's definition makes baptism precede remission, and bring the person baptized into the enjoyment of this blessing.

We now leave, for awhile, the definitions of our writer, and proceed to notice a statement which we must regard as a concession concerning the meaning of *eis*. He says: "When used with some noun which does not denote a locality, but is figurative, expressing an ideal state, relation, etc., still *eis* has the same force, signifying that a person or an action is, as it were, brought and put within the limits of this noun, restricted to this state, relation, or object. From the very nature of the idea thus denoted, this form of expression will be most commonly applied to nouns expressing aim, design, result, and the like." Here we have the concession that when it is used with a noun not denoting a locality, it is still, from the nature of its meaning, most commonly followed by nouns denoting "aim, design, result, and the like." That is, in the expression "be baptized *eis* remission of sins," the remission of sins would be most commonly understood to express the aim, design, or result of the baptism. This is, no doubt, the deliberate judgment of Dr. Broadus, and he, perhaps, feels that in stating it he ought to be looked upon as merely declaring a well-known fact, rather than making a concession. But regarded as coming from the party to which he belongs, it must be considered a concession; for it is one rarely, if ever, made in the controversial writings or speeches of his brethren. He goes

even further in this direction than the words just quoted. After quoting in an abbreviated way the Scripture words about baptism for remission, he says: "We should at first expect, because that is the more common use of *eis* with figurative nouns, that it would be in the sense of design or aim, in order to remission." This, then, is a full concession of the fact, that the sense "in order to remission of sins" is the most common sense of the preposition in such connections, and that it is what "we should at first expect" to be its sense in the passages under discussion. But the author's concession extends still further than this. After stating that *eis* is not always used in this sense before such nouns, and stating two instances which he regards as exceptions, he proceeds to state three ways by which we are to determine in such cases, "what is the more precise idea intended to be conveyed." He should have said, "what is the other idea intended to be conveyed;" for it is an entirely different idea, and not merely a more precise idea, that he contends for. Those three ways are these: "First, from the natural relations existing between the person or action in question, and the something to which it is thus restricted. Second, from the connection in which the statement stands, or the facts of the case as known from other sources. Third, when the subject-matter is theological, we must, of course, look also to the general teachings of the Scriptures, and ask which of the possible relations between this person or action and this noun is in accordance with the general teachings of the Scripture on the subject involved." These rules are not expressed as I would prefer to have them; but I will make no criticism on them, as they are sufficiently accurate to suit my present purpose.

By these three rules, our essayist tries the expression, "Be baptized *eis* remission of sins." He first makes the concession last quoted above, that "we should at first expect, because that is the more common use of *eis* with figurative nouns, that it would be in the sense of design or aim, in order to remission;" and then he applies rule first, "As to the natural relations between baptizing and remission of sins, such a thing is possible, and indeed very much in accordance with the general disposition of man, in every age, to make the spiritual depend on the external." Thus we have the concession that our understanding of the disputed passages stands the test of the first rule; that there is nothing in the natural relation between baptism and remission to render it impossible that the former should be in order to the latter; and further, that such a connection between the two is very much in accordance with the general sentiment of mankind.

The same meaning is next subjected to the test of the second rule, and the result is stated in these words: "Looking to the

connection in which the statements are found, we find nothing to settle the question." We, by no means, admit the full truth of this remark ; but we certainly grant, what the writer fully concedes, that there is nothing in the connection or context of these passages to settle the question in his favor, and nothing opposed to its being settled in our favor. We are left, then, according to the writer's own showing, to his third rule, as the only one that in his judgment forbids understanding baptism to be in order to remission of sins ; that rule is, the analogy of Scripture teaching.

In order to make this last rule available to his purpose, the Doctor clearly perceived that he must show the possibility of attaching to the preposition *eis* in the disputed passages some other than that which he admits to be its more common meaning. This he undertakes to do by referring to two passages in which he thinks it must have another meaning. We will confine our attention, for the sake of brevity, to that one of the two which seems best to serve his purpose, and which he chiefly relies upon: "The Ninevites repented *eis* at the preaching of Jonah." Here, by force of his second rule, he says : " We could hardly imagine this to mean anything else than that they repented with reference to his preaching as the occasion, very well expressed in English by *at*. When we look at the known facts of the history, it becomes certain that such was the case, and such must be the meaning." We will not pause at present to question the correctness of this conclusion. Suppose it, for awhile, to be granted, and let us see how it will affect the argument.

We have, then, the general rule that *eis* in such connections commonly means, in order to. But we find that this particular case is an exception to the general rule ; and we are compelled so to regard it, because the known facts in the case forbid the common meaning. All this being granted, what is proved ? Why, merely, that in this passage *eis* has a certain unusual meaning. Every other passage is still presumed to have the common meaning, until something develops a different meaning in each individual case. That is, the proof that *eis* in some one instance does not mean in order to, does not prove anything at all in reference to its meaning in Acts ii., 38, and parallel passages. It would not at all be necessary to even mention this fact to such a man as Dr. Broadus ; but the same can not be said of the majority of controversialists on his side of the question, and I mention with a reference to their mode of argument.

If there were any known historical facts connected with Peter's command, " Be baptized for remission of sins," to compel a departure from the ordinary meaning of *eis*, it must, of course, be admitted that some other meaning should be sought for. On the other

hand, if there are known historical facts which positively require the ordinary meaning of the term to be admitted in this passage, then it would imply a violation of all the rules of exegesis to hunt for any other meaning. I now proceed to show that this last is actually the case, and to this exhibit I invite the especial attention of Dr. Broadbush, and of all his brethren ; for this is an aspect of the case which they have totally ignored in all the arguments I have yet seen or heard from their side of the house.

The facts in the case are these : When Peter reached a certain point in his sermon, some of his hearers were " pierced to the heart," and cried out, " Brethren, what shall we do ?" At the moment, then, in which Peter used the words in question, these persons were suffering intense agony on account of sins of which they felt themselves guilty. This is simply undeniable. Their sins had not, then, at this moment, been remitted ; for when men's sins are remitted, it is conceded on all hands, and by none more readily than by the Baptists, that the heart is at ease. While, then, their sins are still unremitted, Peter says to them, " Repent, and be baptized (*eis*) for the remission of sins." Now, it is utterly impossible to conceive that *eis* here means " in regard to remission as the occasion " of the baptism, with the further thought that the remission preceded the baptism. This is not only impossible for the reason above given, but for the further reason that it would make Peter command men to repent who were already pardoned ; thus placing repentance as well as baptism after pardon. Unquestionably, the remission of sins was contemplated as a point yet to be attained, a blessing yet to be secured ; and I feel certain that Dr. Broadbush will unhesitatingly admit that when *eis* is used in such a connection, it can not possibly have any other meaning than in order to. Even if we take the Doctor's own rendering of *eis* in the speech of Festus, and read, Repent and be baptized " in regard to " remission of sins ; it is still in regard to a blessing contemplated as future at the time of repentance and baptism, and therefore the only regard they could have to it is that of an antecedent to a subsequent event.

I know it is sometimes alleged, that, notwithstanding all this, the parties immersed on that occasion did enjoy pardon before immersion ; and in proof of this is adduced the statement, that " as many as gladly received the word were baptized." But every observant reader readily perceives that the word received gladly was not Peter's sermon, which had pierced them to the heart ; but the word of his answer, which had assured them of pardon and the gift of the Holy Spirit on terms so accessible. Theirs was not the gladness of pardoned sinners, but the gladness of those who have learned for the first time that pardon is accessible. It was the gladness of the convict in his cell on hearing that the governor is ready and will-

ing to pardon him as soon as he will sign a solemn compact to keep the peace and obey the laws in future. Here, then, we plant ourselves on the actual facts of the case, and challenge the world to meet us here in close and unflinching combat.

But I must not omit some other matters in the Doctor's article. After trying the common meaning of *eis* in the disputed passages by the first two rules, and finding in them no reason to depart from it, he condemns it by the force of the third rule. He says: "When we turn to our remaining means of determining, viz., the general teachings of Scripture, we find these decidedly and positively opposed to the idea that baptism should be the means of securing remission of sins, cutting at the root, as that idea would, of Paul's great and favorite doctrine that justification (which includes remission) proceeds from faith, apart from works of law."

I must here state one serious objection to the Doctor's rule, and one to his method of applying it. First, the rule is not correctly stated. Instead of looking to the general teaching of Scripture on the subject involved, to correct our ideas of a particular passage, we must rather look at other special statements of the Scriptures, and see whether any one or more of these are irreconcilable with the passage in hand taken in the usual sense of its words. If so, a modification must be sought, but not otherwise. To appeal to general teaching, is to appeal to vague notions of our own. There is no general teaching not made up by individual statements, and these must be individually compared.

Second, in applying his rule, instead of referring to the general teaching of the Scripture on the subject involved, he departs from his own rule by referring in a most general way to teachings on another subject. Now the subject involved is the relation of baptism to the remission of sins; and the Doctor's appeal is to Scripture teaching on the relation of justification to works of law. It is true, as he remarks, that justification includes remission, or rather, implies it; but Paul's argument on justification contemplates it with reference to the law of Moses, and the law which the Gentiles had written on their hearts, and not to the positive ordinances of the Christian church. Even here, if we were disposed to enter into the argument, we might show that Paul teaches nothing inconsistent with the position that baptism introduces the penitent believer into the benefits of the death of Christ; but Dr. Broadbush himself must admit that Paul's doctrine is not necessarily inconsistent with the position that remission of sins is enjoyed after baptism, not before. Let justification be by faith, and, if you please, by faith alone; still it might possibly be so arranged that the believer enjoys it after baptism, and not before.

But the objection to the Doctor's mode of applying his rule is, that

he does not appeal to the passages in which the exact subject involved is the subject of discussion. Let him appeal to such passages as the speech of Ananias to Saul, the declaration of Peter that "baptism now saves us ; such statements as that we are baptized into Jesus Christ and into his death. Such facts as that in every known case when persons were baptized, and their joyous feelings indicated, they always occurred after baptism, never before. In all the places where the relation between baptism and remission of sins is mentioned or alluded to, there is perfect harmony with the usual meaning of *eis* in the speech of Peter. Dr. Broadbuss knows full well that here there is not one discordant note ; and we confidently affirm that on no subject treated of in the whole Bible can he show that there is more perfect harmony than on this. By all the rules, therefore, by which this learned writer would test the obvious meaning of these celebrated expressions of Scripture, he has tested them, and they stand the test perfectly in what he himself admits to be the meaning which we should expect to find in them.

I have already shown that the criticisms upon the passage quoted from the speech of Festus, and the remark of Jesus concerning the Ninevites, can not affect the meaning of the passages in dispute. I believe that the Doctor is wrong in his interpretation of both those passages ; but as it would prolong this article beyond what I wish to enter fully into that discussion, and as they were referred to only to show the possibility that *eis* might have some other than its common meaning, not to prove that it has such meaning in the disputed passages, I pass them by for the present.

To another passage which the Doctor quoted for the same purpose, I feel constrained to devote some space just at this point. It is the familiar passage, "I baptize you *eis* unto repentance." He very clearly shows that the facts of John's ministry, particularly the fact that he "required a profession that they did repent before he would baptize them," preclude the supposition that he baptized an individual in order that he might repent. For this reason, he concludes that *eis* must here have some other meaning. Now here we must insist upon the primary law of exegesis, that a word shall have its ordinary meaning, unless there is something to really require a different meaning. If the terms *eis* and repentance can both retain their usual meaning here, and yet yield a sense in perfect harmony with the context, and with all other Scripture statements, it is perfectly undeniable that this is the sense which should be attributed to them. Let repentance, then, be repentance ; and let *eis* be in order to ; then let it be John's object, as it manifestly was, to declare, not the effect on an individual of baptizing him, but the general design of his baptism as an institution affecting the conduct of his cotemporaries, and we have a sense perfectly unexceptionable. It is this : that the

general object of John's baptism was to induce the Jews to repent, and thus prepare them for the Lord. This object was manifestly effected in this way: All who believed in John as a prophet felt it their duty to be baptized in obedience to the God who sent him; but they could not be baptized without repentance; thus the baptism indirectly led to repentance; thus he baptized in order to repentance. He practiced a baptism requiring repentance to precede it, in order that those who wished to be baptized might repent. It was in order to repentance, because no man could receive it without repentance, and repentance was the one great change among the people which he was sent to produce by preaching and practicing his baptism. So far, then, from this passage requiring some unusual meaning to be attached to *eis* or to repentance, it never can be made to yield a clear idea except by allowing each of these terms its usual import.

There are several other matters in the Doctor's article which I would love to discuss, especially the exceedingly vague and untangible conception he is compelled to form of the passages in dispute; a conception which certainly can not find a close fitting-place in such a mind as his, and lie down there like a settled conviction; but absolute want of time, and perhaps of space, compel me to desist. If any words from me could have any influence with Dr. Broaddus and his intelligent and candid brethren, I would beg them, as one who respects them highly, and would be willing to co-operate with them fraternally in the spread of the truth, to re-examine this whole subject *de novo*, and in doing so to divest themselves as nearly as possible from all the shackles of party prejudice and early training. God grant that all the Lord's people may still study his word, and still discuss like brethren their differences, till they shall understand it correctly, and thereby understand it alike.

THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.—Such is the title of a new monthly to be issued from Richmond, Va., in January next, and to be edited by Bros. John G. Parrish and Winthrop H. Hopson. That we now have too many papers for the number of readers we can command is as clear to my mind as an intuition; but among all these there is not one which meets the demand in Virginia, hence the announcement of the *Examiner*. How cordially I commend it to our brotherhood is only measured by the sincere respect and fraternal good feeling which have subsisted between Bro. Hopson and myself for more than twenty years. May God grant that the work of his clear, sound head and noble heart may meet with the response which in my soul I believe it merits.

All communications for the *Examiner* to be directed to Bowling Green, Va. Price of the work, *one dollar a year*.

THE NEW BIRTH.

MODERN systems of theology employ, as equivalent, the following phrases : A change of heart, the purification of the heart or soul, regeneration, and the new birth. As nothing is more essential to the true interpretation of the Holy Scriptures than a correct use of the terms and phrases which therein occur, so nothing has a greater tendency to confuse and bewilder than the loose and latitudinarian manner in which they are frequently employed. The first of the above phrases does not, indeed, occur in the Scriptures ; but the idea commonly attached to it is presented in many passages, and if it is uniformly employed to convey this idea no incongruity will result. But what is ordinarily called a change of heart is very often confounded with what in the Scriptures is called a purification of the heart. This is sometimes done even by those who understand and proclaim "the ancient gospel." When such a proclaimer asserts that a man's heart must be purified before he is immersed, he is involved in this confusion, and forgets for the time being that Peter has located this purification in obedience. (See 1 Peter i., 22.) A change of heart is understood to be a change from the love of the world to the love of God, or, as commonly expressed, from the love of sin to the love of holiness. Such a change must, of course, precede immersion. He who loves the world or the things of the world must experience this essential change before he is qualified to be immersed into Christ ; but this change of the affections is one thing, and the scriptural purification of the heart quite another. This last is equivalent to "the answer of a good conscience toward God," which can be enjoyed by those only who have obtained the forgiveness of sins. If any one desires proof of the equivalency here asserted, let him study the 10th chapter of Hebrews, and compare with this the 13th and 14th verses of the 9th chapter.

As "a change of heart" is often confounded with "the purification of the heart" or soul, so these are frequently confounded with "the new birth," and this in its turn with "regeneration." Regeneration is not an act, but a process, of which the change of heart and the new birth are constituent parts, while the purification of the heart is a result. Let the sequel demonstrate this.

We now raise the question, When is a man "born again?" To this question the Savior himself has happily furnished an answer. Yet, if all the sectarian theologians of the day, both learned and unlearned, should each "show his opinion," not one, we believe, would coincide with that divine answer : "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a

man be born of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." This was intended by the Savior as an explanation of the earlier expression which affirmed the necessity of the new birth in the following language: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God." A man, then, according to the Savior, is "born again" when he is "born of water and of the Spirit." Has water anything to do with a change of heart from the love of sin to the love of holiness? No one will affirm it. A "change of heart," then, is one thing, and "the new birth" is another, unless we reject the Savior's own definition of the latter.

But what is it to be "born of water and of the Spirit?" First, that the birth is one, not two, will not, we presume, be denied. A man is not "born of water" at one time and "of the Spirit" at another; but is "born of the Spirit" when "born of water." Further, that the phrase "born of water" refers to Christian baptism no candid man of any learning has ever pretended to dispute. The vast majority of commentators of any note, we believe, are here agreed. From these premises it logically follows that no one is "born of the Spirit" until he is immersed. But now the question emerges: With what propriety can a person thus born be said to be "born of the Spirit?" In other words, what must be the agency of the Spirit in relation to this great change that it may, under the figure of a birth, be appropriately ascribed to this agent? If the change is brought about by a direct rather than by a remote agency of the Holy Spirit, to say nothing of a birth of water, the very idea of a birth itself is at once annihilated. Again we ask, what peculiar agency of the Spirit must of necessity be supposed that we may have at one and the same time a "birth of water and of the Spirit!" Here are two things, water and the Spirit, the coexistence of which in the new birth the Savior himself has proclaimed. What relation to the new birth does each of these sustain?

In order to furnish a correct answer to this question, it is important to take into consideration a fact which has been entirely overlooked by expositors and critics. In the original, man is said to be born *ex hūdatos* (out of water), whereas the term *Pneumatōs* (of the Spirit) is employed as a simple genitive, not having before it the preposition *ex*. The genitive case, unaccompanied by a preposition, expresses simply the cause or source of an action more or less remote; but when this action is connected with the genitive of the source by the preposition *ex*, the connection, according to Winer, is of "the most intimate" character. He observes, that of all the prepositions which govern the genitive, "beyond doubt *ek* (or *ex*), indicates the closest connection." This learned grammarian defines the preposition before us as follows: "The original signification of *ek* is, issuing from within (the compass, sphere of) something." "Figuratively,"

he says, "this preposition denotes every source and cause out of which something flows or issues." Thus, even in figurative usage, the idea expressed by the phrase "out of" does not depart from this preposition, and able critics affirm that the two are inseparable. The genitive, without this preposition, expresses merely the source of a thing or cause by which it is produced. When accompanied by the preposition, it signifies that out of which something emanates. The following, then, is a literal rendering of the Savior's language: "Except a man be born out of water and of the Spirit he can not enter into the kingdom of God." It is a birth which "issues" from water, and is remotely brought about by the agency of the Holy Spirit.

We have now defined the relation which water sustains to the new birth, as that out of which must issue the person "born again." We have also seen that the agency of the Spirit stands remotely, not immediately, connected with the new birth, and determined to this extent the relation which the Holy Spirit sustains to the new birth. It is not that out of which the birth itself immediately flows, but a remote cause without which the birth could never be. We have not yet, however, determined the specific character of the spiritual agency, in consequence of which a person born of water is properly said to be born also of the Spirit. A person is born of two parents at once; directly of one, and indirectly of the other. Now the Holy Spirit is the figurative father of the spiritual child; otherwise the figure before us is devoid of sense. We are at a loss to know what meaning the expression "born of water and of the Spirit" can possibly have upon any other supposition. The employment of the figure is based upon the resemblance of relations, and nothing less than this can justify its use, as the resemblance of relations is of the very essence of analogy. A figurative birth implies a figurative parentage; for to say that one thing is born of another, is to say that the second is a parent of the first. Accordingly, the simple expression "born of the Spirit" represents the Spirit as a figurative parent in general terms, while the phrase "born of water and of the Spirit" represents the Spirit as the figurative father, in consideration of what was seen to be the relation which water sustains to the new birth. It is now evident that the term begotten describes the indirect or remote agency of the Spirit, in consequence of which a person born of water is born also of the Spirit. The terms begotten and born are used in the English Scriptures to represent one word in the Greek, and this fact has led many to suppose that these words are employed to denote the same thing, but the original term is not indifferently represented by the one or the other of these words as taste may suggest; on the contrary, the selection is necessarily determined by the circumstances under which the original term is employed. Sometimes it is impossible to translate by the term born, as in Matt. ii., 2. At other

times it is equally impossible to translate by the term begotten, as in Matt. ii., 21. The fact, then, that these two words represent but one Greek term, does not prove that they are equivalent in sense, but only that the original word is ambiguous and equivalent in meaning to both of the English terms. To be begotten by the Spirit, and to be born of the Spirit, are two distinct things, though often confounded. The new birth being one, we are "born of the Spirit" when we are "born of water," and this in consequence of having been previously begotten by the Spirit. In using the phrase "begotten by the Spirit," we employ an expression not found in the Scriptures, but one equivalent to the scriptural phrase "begotten of God."

We now discover the source of a radical error exposed in the beginning of this essay. By supposing that to be "begotten of God" or of the Spirit is to be "born of the Spirit" of God, men have been led to ascribe to each state the attributes of the other, and thus have confounded, as we have seen, this new birth with a change of heart. A man certainly experiences a change of heart when he is begotten of God; and he who supposes that to be begotten of God is to be born again, will of necessity confound the new birth with a change of heart. Confusion thus begets confusion, and leads the bewildered mind far away from the truth into the labyrinths of error. An instance of this is likewise found in the false and antiscritptural account frequently given of the manner in which a person is begotten of God. The Scriptures are as clear as light itself on this point. "Of his own will," says James, "begat he us with the word of truth." And Paul, too, discourses as follows: "Though you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have you not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." A person thus begotten and afterward "born of water and of the Spirit" is declared by Peter to be "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which lives and abides forever." Thus we have Peter, Paul, and James unequivocally explaining the manner in which we are begotten of God or of the Spirit of God; and yet their explanation is completely ignored and their affirmations flatly denied by a popular theory which we will now proceed to state and consider.

The theory may be stated as follows: In order to be begotten of God there is requisite a direct agency of the Holy Spirit, or influence other than that exerted through the truth. We shall soon see that those who advocate this theory are compelled in consistency to deny that the word of God, or any influence exerted through that word, has anything to do whatever with the new birth or its antecedents, and thus place themselves in direct antagonism with the apostles mentioned above. What, then, is the ground on which the theory rests? It consists in the supposition that man, on account of hereditary depravity, is morally and spiritually dead to such an extent that he is

utterly incapable of all spiritual activity ; that being "dead in trespasses and sins," he is literally and absolutely unable to perform any spiritual act until he is regenerated or born again. If this doctrine be true, a special—yes, miraculous—influence of the Spirit is certainly essential to the new birth. Let us first, then, examine the pretended scriptural basis of the doctrine on which is predicated the theory of spiritual influence under consideration.

That men before conversion are "dead in trespasses and sins," the Scriptures unequivocally assert. Many similar expressions occur in the New Testament. But that man in that state is so utterly dead to all that is good that he can not do aught that is right, the Scriptures nowhere affirm. The nearest approximation to it is found, perhaps, in the following expressions of Paul : "To be carnally minded is death. * * * Because the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." That man, as long as he is carnally minded, can not be subject to God's law or do that which is pleasing to him is here clearly asserted ; but that he can not cease to be carnally minded and become spiritually minded without a miracle, and a miracle as great as that by which Lazarus was raised from the dead, is by no means affirmed. The capital error committed by those who press these and similar passages into the service of the above theory is one of very frequent occurrence. It consists in the unwarranted extension of a figure. They reason in this way : When a man is dead he is incapable of motion or action of any kind. But the Scriptures pronounce the unrenewed morally and spiritually dead. Therefore they "can neither think a good thought nor do a good deed." Does experience sanction or facts sustain the conclusion ? We know that all history belies it. But what shall we say of the logic ? Do the Scriptures ascribe to a figurative death all the consequences of a literal death ? If they do, then, when the children of light are said to be "dead to the world," can they think a sinful thought or do a sinful deed ? If not, why does Paul exhort them to cleanse themselves "from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God ?" Though dead to sin and alive to God, they were yet capable of sinful thoughts and deeds while incapable, it is true, of "continuing in sin," or "living any longer therein" as the ungodly do. If, then, the Scriptures do not consider a figurative death in all respects equal to a literal death, the syllogism before us is convicted of a vice known among logicians as the ambiguous middle. In nothing is a nice discrimination or precision of judgment in a higher degree requisite than in handling the figures of the Bible. It is here that we find the greatest, as well as the most numerous, specimens of perverse interpretation. At one time more and at another less than the actual import of a figure is seized upon to answer the purpose of

a theorist. Of the former we have just seen an instance, while the latter was amply illustrated in our reflection on the figure of a birth.

But these errors in interpretation give rise, as we have seen, to doctrinal errors, which in their turn produce others, and thus illustrates, what we have already had occasion to observe, that confusion begets confusion, until we have "confusion worse confounded." A false view of spiritual death generates a theory of human depravity, which holds man, in regeneration, to be as passive as a machine, while this theory necessitates another equally pernicious, according to which such an influence is requisite to his recovery from sin as renders the word of God wholly powerless to that end, notwithstanding it is represented in the word itself as the instrument by which this grand work is effected. The advocates of these theories pretend to have a place in their scheme for the word of God, but their inconsistency will immediately be seen. With them faith is, and must of necessity be, the result of regeneration. The exercise of faith is a spiritual act, and all such acts, according to their theory, proceed from a regenerated soul. Now the word of God can have no influence over the man of no faith. Whatever it accomplishes in behalf of humanity must be accomplished through faith. It is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes," and has no efficacy whatever to save him that believes not. This is not only scriptural, but self-evidently true. If, then, regeneration is prior to faith, and the word of God is powerless in the absence of faith, it follows that the word of God has nothing whatever to do with regeneration. If we substitute for the term regeneration the new birth as a phrase expressive of the consummating act, the reasoning is the same. Indeed, with the advocates of the theory under consideration the two expressions are synonymous. Here, then, the theory is in direct antagonism with the scriptural doctrines quoted above, to the effect that we are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which lives and abides forever." We pronounce this teaching utterly irreconcilable with the theory before us. Yet the attempt has been made to harmonize the two. To this end a faith differing in kind from "saving faith" has been invented, and man is said to exercise the former before regeneration, but the latter only as the effect of this great change. Agrippa, it is said, "had faith, but not the faith that secures salvation." Of what value, then, we ask, was it to him, or to anybody else? Hear Rice in debate with Campbell: "The kind of faith exercised by Agrippa, though it could not secure justification and eternal life, is not useless. It induces men to hear the word, to read it, to think of it; and God may, through the truth, renew and sanctify them. This faith precedes regeneration; but the faith that works by love and overcomes the world is consequent upon regeneration. He who is induced to em-

brace fundamental error is not likely ever to be converted ; for God does not sanctify through error. But he who theoretically believes the truth may be converted and sanctified by the Spirit through the truth." (Debate, pp. 704-5.)

Did the author of this evasion suppose that it would pass for a solution of the difficulty in hand? But the attempt to evade is itself exceedingly awkward, as it indirectly grants the incorrectness of the theory which he labors to uphold. Is the exercise of that faith which "induces men to hear the word, to read it, to think of it," a spiritual act or not? If it is not, what, we crave to know, is the nature of this nondescript which, though destitute of all spirituality, is yet sufficient to render the word of God efficacious in the work of regeneration? But if it is a spiritual act, then this faith which "precedes regeneration" is actually the result of regeneration, by virtue of the theory under consideration, according to which "spiritual acts flow from spiritual life" in those who "are first quickened;" just as "a dead man does not perform the acts which flow from life," but "is first alive and then acts." Behold, then, the dilemma in which the advocates of this theory are involved. Man is either born again by the word of God, as the incorruptible seed, upon the exercise of a faith that is not spiritual and not saving, or he is capable of exercising some spiritual acts while "dead in trespasses and sins," unless regeneration is prior to itself. The first supposition is contradictory and absurd, while the second is an abandonment of the theory in question. But the most wonderful feature of the case is the fact that, upon either supposition, the faith which is pronounced merely "theoretical," as "not the faith that secures salvation," turns out to be the only saving faith in the premises, while that faith which is said to be the result of regeneration is merely the effect of the salvation from sin obtained through the exercise of the first. Thus the sapient doctor to whom reference has been made, in attempting to rid his theory of one difficulty accumulates many others as a fitting reward for his sophistical labors. Apparently aware of his weakness in this endeavor, he makes another effort, in which he actually concedes the insuperable strength of the difficulty over which he laboriously toils. Hear him again: "God is pleased to work by means when they can be employed. And not only does he employ means where they are wholly inefficient without the exertion of his power, but he has employed such means as had not the least tendency to produce the desired effect. Our Savior used clay and spittle in opening the eyes of a blind man."

Let it be remembered that this champion of modern orthodoxy is aiming to reconcile his new theory of the new birth with the necessity for the ministry of the word, which necessity grows out of the fact that the word of God is described in the Bible as the "incorruptible seed" of which men are "born again"—the grand instru-

mentality through which we are regenerated, or begotten and born of God. And how is this reconciliation supposed to be effected? Why, that "God has employed such means as had not the least tendency to produce the desired effect," as when the "Savior used clay and spittle in opening the eyes of a blind man." This is a clear intimation that the word of God has no more efficiency or inherent efficacy to regenerate a man than clay and spittle have to impart vision to the blind. It is therefore a virtual admission that those Scriptures which ascribe the new birth to the word as the "seed" from which springs the new life, can not be reconciled with modern orthodoxy. Has seed in the animal and vegetable kingdoms "not the least tendency" to develop the life inherent in itself? The word of God is divinely represented as "living and powerful," as "spirit and life," and, like the seed in both kingdoms to which it is compared, will, under proper and favorable circumstances, produce its living and beautiful fruit in the lives of those who are thus "born again." How different is all this from the senseless comparison in the extract before us! The clay and spittle alluded to, were not, as here affirmed, employed as the "means" of giving sight to the blind; they "had not," as truly asserted, "the least tendency" to produce that effect, and for that very reason they could not have been used as the means of accomplishing that end. They were employed in connection with another fact, simply as a condition upon which a *miracle* was performed for the accomplishment of the desired effect. If the Scriptures had stated that men receive their sight through spittle and clay, or by means of their use, just as it is said that they are "begotten through the gospel," there would have been some parallelism between the two cases. But when the author of the comparison himself pronounces the supposed "means" in the one case to be "wholly inefficient" and without "the least tendency to produce the desired effect" until a miracle is wrought to that end, it follows, if the comparison is to hold good, that the word of God is to be regarded as "wholly inefficient" in the work of regeneration, and that the performance of a miracle is essential. Indeed, this is the true import of the theory. For if man in a state of spiritual death is as incapable of putting forth a spiritual act as the physically dead are to move, the power requisite to give life in the one case is essential also in the other. The resurrection of the dead is undeniably miraculous, and the new birth no less so, if the doctrine we are combating is true. Man thus becomes as passive as a machine, to act only as acted upon. Of course, it would be absurd to even hint at his accountability. Let us now sum up the results of this precious bait of orthodoxy *par excellence*. 1. It makes conversion a miracle. 2. Reduces man to a machine. 3. Destroys human responsibility. 4. Makes the word of God null and void. 5. Contradicts some of its plainest declarations.

The last item, though clearly evinced already, is susceptible of additional exemplification. Faith and obedience, as spiritual acts, are supposed to flow from regeneration, while regeneration is supposed to be equivalent to the purification of the heart or soul. The Holy Spirit, it is said, through a direct operation, purifies the heart, and the heart thus purified exercises true faith and prompts to a hearty, acceptable obedience. Now Peter, whose teaching in general seems to stand very much in the way of these truly orthodox theorists, ruthlessly demolishes this beautiful statement of the case, and gives in his own homely way the following account: "You know that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." Here note before we hear Peter out, that the faith of the Gentiles came not by an abstract operation of the Spirit, but through "hearing the word of the gospel;" Peter agreeing exactly with Paul, that "faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God." Peter proceeds: "And God, who knows the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, as unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts, by faith." Thus, according to Peter's statement, the Gentiles, like the Jews, first obtained faith through the word, and then obtained the purification of their hearts through the faith thus obtained, while the Holy Spirit was given to confer neither faith nor purification; but to be a witness to the Gentiles that God had put no difference between the Jews and themselves, and that he would accept them upon the same faith in his Son, and purify their hearts by that faith as he had done those of the Jews. How extremely unorthodox was this man Peter! Why, he makes faith a cause and the purification of the heart the effect, instead of the reverse! But, then, he did pretty well for the day in which he lived. Who does not see that, though an effect may become a cause, it can never be a cause of that of which it is an effect. Faith can not be both the cause and the effect of the purification of the heart. Still, it would, perhaps, be better to abide with Peter and part company with his orthodox opponents. That this, indeed, has become a necessity is now obvious to all. Yet the wily debater and theological trickster referred to above asserts that "the expression, 'purifying their hearts by faith,' it would not be difficult to prove, militates not against the doctrine of special divine influence;" to wit, such "special divine influence" as it is contended must operate independently of faith to the purification of the heart. Instead, however, of attempting to execute the task which he thus professes to regard as "not difficult," he takes good care not to add another word on the subject, just as he had passed over in utter silence the other passage of Peter in which the word of God is represented as the seed incorruptible of which man is born again. This was done simply and

solely because he knew that his anti-scriptural dogma palpably and flagrantly contradicted these clear declarations of the apostle.

But we are not yet through with these contradictions. Obedience, true and acceptable, as a spiritual act, and also as the legitimate fruit of true faith, must, upon the theory under consideration, be the result of purification; the purification of the soul. Now hear that same troublesome Peter again: "Seeing you have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently." Here the exhortation addressed to these brethren, to "love one another with a pure heart fervently," is based upon the fact that they had obtained a pure heart "in obeying the truth." But the word "soul" is used in one case, and the term "heart" in the other, showing that the two are used synonymously. The apostle does not say, according to the modern conception, that they had symbolized by obedience a purification already obtained, but that they had actually obtained the purification of their souls "in obeying the truth." Nor does he ascribe this purification to any efficacy of obedience, but simply locates it in that fact. They had not obtained the purification of their souls prior to, but in, obedience. Now we affirm that this passage, like those previously adduced, can never be harmonized with the theory we have been considering. Neither can it be reconciled with the statement sometimes made by those who should be better informed, that a man's heart must be purified before he is immersed. The heart is never purified in the scriptural sense, until the remission of sins has been obtained. "Having a High-priest over the house of God," says Paul, "let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." As long as a man remains in his sins, his heart is not sprinkled from an evil conscience, is not purified. Now "the answer of a good conscience," according to Peter, is obtained in baptism, and hence it is erroneous to say that the heart is purified prior to this.

We conclude this essay by enumerating and specifying the errors of those who advocate the popular theory of the new birth.

1. They confound the new birth with a change of heart, the consequent with the antecedent.
2. They confound the new birth with the purification of the heart, the cause with the effect.
3. They confound the new birth with regeneration, or part the whole.
4. They do away with the word of God to which, as the "incorruptible seed," the Scriptures ascribe the new birth.
5. They do away with water, whose coexistence with the Spirit in the new birth the Savior himself has decreed.

6. They annihilate the very idea of a birth, and destroy this impressive figure by their theory.

7. They base their theory upon a perversion of those Scriptures which represent the unconverted as spiritually dead.

8. They transform the new birth into a miracle, degenerate man to a machine, destroy human responsibility, make the word of God null and void, and palpably contradict many of its clearest declarations.

G.

THE BAPTISTS.—I sincerely regret the unlovely spirit many of the Baptists in the State of Kentucky are evincing toward us just at this time. I regret it because it can be productive of no good, and because it may work mischief. What end do they expect to effect by their spirit and opposition? Have they seriously considered this question? I surely think not. For some time past we have, for grave special reasons, been seeking to cultivate friendly relations with the Baptists. From this in no event could evil arise. We wished to know them thoroughly, in hope that we might have cause to love them better. Their acquaintance, too, with us we hoped would become closer and more spiritual, that in the end we might be objects of kindlier feelings on their part. It appears, however, that our courtesy and delicate bearing, particularly since their own proposition to investigate the grounds of a possible union, have been lost in large measure. The ungracious manner in which our advances have been met has had no effect but to fill us with sorrow. We are disappointed in the Baptists. We did, at least, expect to see in them some fruit of the superior religion to which they lay claim. Up to this date our expectations have by no means been so fully realized as we desired. We shall still, however, live in hope that a change for the better may come over the spirit of this people. As for us, it is our duty to pray for them, and, "with all their faults, love them still." They do not blush (some of them) to say we are unregenerate in heart, and even to call us by hard names. Let our conduct be such that even men of the world shall see who it is that "has the spirit of Christ." We must remember that, like Paul, we are not always to please ourselves. Let the present be a case. The Baptists think us wrong; in love and gentleness, at least, let us show them that we are their masters. Where they say hard things, let us say kind; where they are unamiable, let us be the reverse. In the end, victory will be declared for him who is in the right.

From the Western Recorder.

ELDER GOSS AND THE RICHMOND, VA., CONVENTION—
KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA CAMPBELITES.

*“Bro. Dudley :—*On a recent trip down the Ohio, from Cincinnati, to Louisville, I ‘fell in’ with an old friend from Richmond, Va., who, after mutual assurances of agreeable surprise at thus meeting, introduced me to his traveling companion from the Old Dominion, Rev. Mr. Goss, of the ‘Goss-Broaddus Reunion Convention.’ This introductory allusion to Mr. Goss’ antecedents naturally enough led the way to remarks upon the design of the convention of Baptists and Reformers at Richmond, the cause of its failure to accomplish the object for which it assembled, etc. My friend, who is a distinguished Baptist minister of Richmond, and worthily wears the honorary decoration of D. D., expressed himself as hopeful of the ultimate union of the two denominations interested, when they should better understand each other, and be disposed to ascertain how many and what points of agreement existed between them, instead of magnifying the number and importance of the points wherein they differ. He thought it probable, and that Mr. Goss would so find it, that the Virginia Reformers were theologically considerably nearer the Baptists than were the Reformers of Kentucky. Mr. Goss excepted to the correctness of the Doctor’s last remark, and was indisposed to accept it as an excuse or an apology for the violent opposition manifested by Kentucky Baptists to the course pursued by their Virginia brethren in going into the Richmond Convention. The differences in doctrine between Baptists and Reformers were, he said, of less importance than those between Baptists and Methodists, Presbyterians, and other denominations whom Baptists recognize as evangelical, and to whom we profess to extend the hand of Christian fellowship and denominational courtesy, while we withhold both from the Reformers, who so nearly harmonize with us in doctrine, and who agree with us precisely in church polity.

“My friend, the Doctor, could see no good ground for withholding the denominational courtesy insisted upon by Mr. Goss, and remarked that this was practiced by Virginia pastors ; that they invited reformed preachers into their pulpits, to some extent at least. Seeing that the views and the practice of Kentucky Baptists were not likely to find a defender in the Doctor, I replied to Mr. Goss, as his remarks seemed to have been made for my enlightenment in the premises : ‘Mr. Goss, you do not understand us, or you would not regard us as either wrong or inconsistent in withholding from the Reformers, as a body, either Christian fellowship or denominational courtesy.

While you regard the differences between us as non-essential and of little importance, we regard them as essential and fundamental in doctrine.' 'Wherein do we differ in regard to the essentials of Christianity, or what do you regard as essential?' 'Baptists believe, with Paul, that we are saved by faith, and not by works of law. You hold, if I understand your views as set forth by Mr. Campbell and your ablest writers, to baptismal regeneration, or at least that immersion is as essential to salvation as are repentance and faith. You also hold, with Mr. Campbell, that faith is simply believing with all the heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Baptists hold that faith, evangelical faith, is a belief of all that Christ taught respecting the plan of redemption.' Mr. Goss replied, that he had read everything Mr. Campbell had ever published on this subject, and that he had been misunderstood or misrepresented by those who had charged him with teaching the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, or pardon, or remission; that he accepted what Mr. Campbell had written on this point as the doctrine of the New Testament Scriptures; that it was an easy matter to prove almost any doctrine, even from the Bible, by interpreting isolated passages, without reference to their connection with other portions of the inspired word; and in this way Mr. Campbell had been misrepresented as teaching baptismal regeneration.

"Wishing to get at Mr. Goss' views on this point rather than his opinion of Mr. Campbell's theology, I remarked, that if he would permit me to ask him a single question, the answer, affirmative or negative, would indicate clearly his views of the design of baptism. 'Suppose,' I asked, 'a man comes forward professing repentance and faith, and solicits baptism at your hands. You believe him to be a true penitent and a believer, with all the heart, in Jesus Christ as the Son of God; do you believe with Mr. Campbell that until he is immersed he is yet in his sins, unpardoned, lost, unredeemed; or do you believe that he is saved, pardoned, redeemed, and that he hath eternal life?' Mr. Goss affirmed that in the case supposed the applicant for baptism, though a penitent believer in Jesus Christ, was not pardoned or saved before baptism; that this act of obedience, as well as repentance and faith, was essential to remission of his sins and the reception of pardon. He also contended that there was no authority for asking a candidate for baptism any question respecting his faith, but this: 'Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?' Mr. Goss was well qualified, I should think, to represent Kentucky Reformers in the Convention at Richmond.

VIA TOR."

COMMENTS.

Several thoughts worthy of note are suggested by the preceding.

1. That the Baptists of Virginia desire a union with the Disciples of that State.

2. That the Baptist preachers of Kentucky are opposed to a union with the Disciples of Kentucky.

3. That the Baptists of Virginia recognize the Disciples of that State as Christians, and extend to them the courtesies of Christian fellowship.

4. That the Baptist preachers of Kentucky refuse this recognition, and do not extend these courtesies to the Disciples of Kentucky.

Now these differences must arise from the fact, that the Disciples of Kentucky differ in religious teaching and practice from the Disciples of Virginia ; or from the fact, that the Baptist preachers of Kentucky differ from the Baptists of Virginia.

That the Disciples of Virginia and Kentucky teach and practice alike, in all essential particulars, is manifest to all persons acquainted with them.

Dr. W. H. Hopson, long one of the most popular preachers among the Disciples of Kentucky, is now, and has been for several years, the preacher of the church in Richmond, Va.

Mr. Goss, for many years one of the most acceptable preachers and teachers among the Disciples of Virginia, is now acting in the same capacity, with equal acceptability, in Hopkinsville, Ky.

A large portion of the Kentucky preachers were educated at Bethany College ; and in the same classes with those who have been, and those who are now, the leading preachers among the Disciples in Virginia.

The productions of the writers of both States have been published in the same numbers of the same religious papers and periodicals, and read and approved by the Disciples of both States for the last forty years.

The preachers of Virginia are as acceptable to the Disciples of Kentucky as are the preachers of Kentucky, and *vice versa*.

Hence, it is plain that the reason for the difference in the bearing of the Baptist preachers of Kentucky, and in that of the Baptists of Virginia, toward the Disciples is not because the Disciples of the one State differ from those of the other State ; consequently, it follows, that it is because the Baptist preachers of Kentucky differ from the Baptists of Virginia. There is, therefore, a manifest difference between the Baptist preachers of the two States.

It will be observed that I say " the Baptist *preachers* of Kentucky ;" for I am persuaded that, but for the opposition of their preachers, the Baptists of Kentucky would generally desire a union between the two peoples as earnestly as do the better informed and more unselfish preachers of Virginia.

I would not, however, include in this remark all the Baptist preachers of Kentucky ; for among them are noble examples of men, whose Christian spirit and sympathies are too large and Christ-like to be confined within the narrow channel of sectarian partisanship.

The distinguished Baptist minister of Richmond would not defend "the views and practices of the Kentucky Baptists." And why not? Because "he could see no good ground" for them. They were different from his own views and practices and those of the Virginia Baptists. Of course he thought them wrong.

But Viator rallies to their defense. He thinks if Mr. Goss understood the Baptist preachers of Kentucky he would not think them inconsistent. They regard the differences between the Disciples and themselves "as essential and fundamental in doctrine." He says:

"Baptists believe with Paul," etc. Of course, the Disciples do not agree with Paul! So says Viator, by implication.

If this be true, the Disciples ought not to be fellowshipped by any Christian. But is this charge true? Nay, verily! Let Paul affirm any proposition to be true, and every Disciple would rather die than reject it.

But what is that which the Baptists and Paul believe, and the Disciples do not believe?

Viator says it is that "we are saved by faith and not by works of law."

Every Disciple in Kentucky who has read or heard all Paul's Epistles believes this; therefore the charge against them, implied by this statement, is erroneous and unjust, and the reason for non-fellowship based upon that charge is equivalent to no reason at all.

But Viator proceeds: "You hold, if I understand your views, etc., that immersion is as essential to salvation as are repentance and faith."

The Disciples hold no such thing. God only knows the precise and relative value of faith, repentance, and immersion. The Disciples do not, and therefore do not affirm. That, as individuals, many of them entertain opinions on this subject, is doubtless true. The writer of these lines certainly does, and he is free to say that that opinion is not the one which Viator attributes to the Disciples.

But even if it were true, which I am sure it is not, that the Disciples generally entertain the opinion attributed to them by Viator, what is there so terribly erroneous and injurious in that opinion, as to demand the rejection of all who hold it from the pale of Christian fellowship?

I can readily conceive that the man who flatly contradicts the plain statement of the word of God, or whose opinions necessarily lead to the nullifying of its sanctions, should not be recognized as a Christian; but where have the Scriptures declared that faith is more essential to salvation than repentance or immersion? I have no recollection of such a Scripture. Am I told that "without faith it is impossible to please God?" It is also said: "Except you repent, you shall likewise perish."

Is it written : "He that believeth not shall be damned." It is also written : "The Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being immersed ;" and Jesus said : "Except a person be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

Nor do I perceive wherein that opinion would necessarily tend to nullify the sanctions of the word of God. For, if it were true, the necessity of a living faith in Jesus Christ, of a hearty and profound penitence for sin, of love to God and to the Redeemer, would be just as palpable and as great in the estimation of those holding as those rejecting the opinion. Viator continues : "You also hold, with Mr. Campbell, that faith is simply the believing with all the heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."

For once Viator understands and states correctly the position of the Disciples ; for which I give him credit.

John said : "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book ; but these are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." (ch. xx., 30, 31.)

Do the Baptists of Kentucky believe with all their heart that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ? Certainly ; then they have faith, and I will love them, though some of them, and their preachers particularly, may have many crude and unphilosophic opinions and speculations concerning that precious and heart-purifying faith.

But hear Viator again : "Baptists hold that faith, evangelical faith, is a belief of all that Christ taught respecting the plan of redemption." If this definition be correct, no one has faith unless he believes "all that Christ taught respecting the plan of redemption."

Can a man believe anything of which he never heard ; of which he knows nothing ? Surely not. "How shall they believe on Him of whom they have not heard ?" (Rom. x., 14.)

Jesus did many things that were not written ; doubtless he spake and taught very many things concerning the plan of redemption which were not recorded in the New Testament. Who has heard all these things ? Who knows anything about all of them ? No living man. Therefore no living man believes them all ; simply because that to believe anything of which a man has heard nothing, and knows nothing, is literally impossible.

But it may be said, Viator means all that Christ taught respecting the plan of redemption that is recorded in the New Testament.

Let us suppose he does. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of the good Baptists of Kentucky who never read or heard all that is recorded in the New Testament of the teaching of Christ respecting the plan of redemption. Of some of these teachings they have read nothing, heard nothing, know nothing, and therefore they believe

nothing. And if Viator's definition be correct, they have no faith ! I do not use this illustration invidiously ; for a similar lack of information might, I dare say, be found in every denomination in the land, and even in the Church of Christ itself. But I use it to show that, if Viator's teaching be true, there are thousands of God-loving members of the Baptist Church who are without faith, and are consequently unpardoned and resting under condemnation, not because they do not believe in Christ, but because they do not believe many things which they know not whether Christ ever taught !

Yet, notwithstanding they have no faith and are unpardoned, the Baptist preachers of Kentucky can consistently and cordially fellowship them ! But the Disciples ! Ah ! it would be wicked to fellowship them !

But again. It may be said : Viator meant that faith is "the belief of all that the party understands Christ to have taught respecting the plan of redemption." If this be so, the Disciples all have faith ; for every one of them believes all he understands Christ to have taught respecting the plan of redemption, and respecting everything else, because Christ, in whom he believes, taught it.

Still, Viator's definition is not correct ; for the faith of the New Testament is not the belief of any doctrine, any teaching ; but belief in a person—in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God.

Of course, he who believes Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, believes Jesus would teach nothing not true, would command nothing not right. It follows, therefore, that another reason assigned for the opposition of some of the Baptist preachers of Kentucky against the Disciples is based upon a misapprehension, and hence is no reason at all.

But again : "You hold, if I understand your views, * * * to baptismal regeneration." I suppose Viator employs the term "regeneration" in the sense commonly attached to it by Baptist preachers—"a scriptural designation for the new birth ; that work of the Holy Spirit by which we experience a change of heart or receive a holy disposition." According to this, the phrase "baptismal regeneration" would imply that in or by immersion a person receives that work of the Holy Spirit by which he experiences a change of heart, or receives a holy disposition."

If the Disciples hold this, they differ widely from the Baptists in opinion ; but even then it might be seriously questioned whether this diversity of opinion would justify the severance of that fellowship which is based upon faith in and obedience to Jesus the Christ, and not upon agreement in any opinion or system of opinions, whether they be right, or whether they be wrong. But the Disciples hold no such view. With one unanimous voice they repudiate it. They do not hold that a change of heart is experienced or received in, by, or

through immersion. On the contrary, they teach that every man's heart must be changed before he is fit or qualified to be immersed. And while they, with most of the learned, understand immersion to be "the washing of regeneration;" and that whenever a penitent believer is properly immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, he is "born of water," "born again," they also teach that "the new birth" sustains the same relation to a man's "regeneration" that his natural birth does to his natural generation. That neither the first nor the second birth gave life; but that each only ushered into another state the being that had life before it was born; that every one must be begotten by God, and made alive by the Holy Spirit, before he is immersed. Otherwise he can not be a Christian, though he be immersed a thousand times. He, therefore, who affirms that the Disciples hold "baptismal regeneration" in the popular acceptance of that phrase, either honestly misapprehends or dishonestly misrepresents their teaching. Hence another reason assigned for the opposition of the Baptist preachers of Kentucky against the Disciples is without foundation. Dr. M.

THE UNITY OF THE BIBLE.—As in Beethoven's matchless music there runs one idea, worked out through all the changes of measure and of key; now almost hidden, now breaking out in rich natural melody, whispered in the treble, murmured in the bass, dimly suggested in the prelude, but growing clearer and clearer as the work proceeds, winding gradually back till it ends in the key in which it began, and closes in triumphant harmony; so throughout the whole Bible there runs one great idea: man's ruin by sin, and his redemption by grace; in a word, Jesus Christ the Savior. This runs through the Old Testament, that prelude to the new; dimly promised at the fall, and more clearly to Abraham; typified in the ceremonies of the law; all the events of sacred history paving the way for his coming; his descent proved in the genealogies of Ruth and Chronicles; spoken of as Shiloh by Jacob, as the Star by Balaam, as the Prophet by Moses; the David of the Psalms; the Redeemer looked for by Job; the Beloved of the Song of Songs. We find him in the sublime strains of the lofty Isaiah, in the writings of the tender Jeremiah, in the mysteries of the contemplative Ezekiel, in the visions of the beloved Daniel, the great idea growing clearer and clearer as the time drew on. Then the full harmony broke out in the song of the angels: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." And evangelists and apostles taking up the theme, the strain closes in the same key in which it begun—the devil, who troubled the first paradise, forever excluded from the second; man restored to the favor of God, and Jesus Christ the key-note of the whole.

REASON AND REVELATION.

SUCH is the title of a book just submitted to the reading public by President Milligan, of Kentucky University. The book is issued from the press of R. W. Carroll & Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, and certainly does credit to the taste and skill of those gentlemanly and enterprising printers. Its workmanship is excellent, its appearance even fascinating. It is executed on large type well spaced, and on fair paper of sufficient body. It is a finely proportioned volume of 445 pages; and by its grace and beauty must certainly commend itself to all the lovers of excellence in the art of printing.

The appearance of this book at the present time strikes me as a happy providence, and will, I trust, in the end, evince that a hand far more unerring than that of its prudent and cautious author has had something to do in its preparation. The age in which we live is dangerously rationalistic. With too many it is now true that reason is God; or if not reason, something which blushes not to wear its name. By this I am not to be understood as speaking against reason proper; I speak only against the abuse of it; and against substituting its deliverances, whether true or false, for those of the divine mind. This rationalistic tendency of the age deserves to be completely checked. In no way can this be so effectually done as by pointing out the true province of reason in matters of revelation. This the present work professes to do. "My theme," says President Milligan in his opening sentence, "is the province of reason in matters pertaining to divine revelation." To this sentence I should have given a slightly different form. I would not simply have said, the province of reason in matters *pertaining to* divine revelation, but the province of reason in revelation and in the matters pertaining to it. Reason can do but little injury when employed on matters which merely *pertain to* revelation. Its danger emerges chiefly when it invades revelation itself, and dares to annul it or set it aside. But this is an immaterial point, and not worth stopping to consider. Certainly there are most important matters which simply pertain to revelation, in which reason has its province. This is not denied. But it is when dealing with revelation itself that reason is to be most closely watched, and its province most sharply defined.

In setting forth more fully the province of reason the President says: "Reason, then, has something to do, even in religious matters. But it does not follow that her influence here is absolute, or that she is at liberty to reject as spurious or absurd whatever she can not herself fully explain and comprehend. Not at all. Her powers and

functions are limited. She must have the necessary evidence before she can decide on the truth or falsity of any proposition. She may, it is true, form an opinion on any subject, but even this opinion will be found, on examination, to depend on the implied probabilities or improbabilities of the case. The uninstructed youth, for example, would not hesitate for a moment to answer in the negative the question, whether or not the planet Jupiter is inhabited. As he looks up into the heavens, he sees there, under the name of Jupiter, but a bright spot, apparently not near so large as the small sunflower in his father's garden. And hence, from the evidence in his possession, he can not think that it would be a suitable residence for such beings as are men and women. But let him now be informed that the earth was made for man; that its vast mineral, vegetable, and animal resources were all designed for the comfort and happiness of beings formed in the image and likeness of their Creator; let him be further told, or made to understand, on reliable evidence, that Jupiter is about fourteen hundred times larger than the earth; that it has four times as many satellites; that it revolves on its axis and in its orbit, like the earth; and that, on the whole, it has a much greater influence in the solar system than our own little planet, and soon his doubts will begin to change, and his reason will finally decide in favor of the probability of its being inhabited by some such rational and accountable beings as man. I say *probability*, because, the evidence being only probable, the conclusion must also be probable. But let the evidence be conclusive or demonstrative, and so, also, will be the conclusion. Concede, for example, that all men are mortal, and that Socrates is a man, and then reason will, of necessity, draw the conclusion that Socrates is mortal. If she is not satisfied with the conclusion, she may review the premises. But let their correctness be conceded, and then *reason has no alternative left but to draw the conclusion, and to acquiesce in it, whether she fully comprehends it or not.* This, then, is her province in every department of truth to which the human mind has access. It is simply by a process of abstraction, comparison, and generalization to draw from the data otherwise furnished, the proper inferences and conclusions."

Here the province of reason is exhaustively laid down. *It is simply to draw the proper inference or conclusion from given premises.* It is not, then, the province of reason to invent anything. Her duty is to accept and lawfully use what another supplies, not herself to supply. Confining this to the matter of revelation, and it is unquestionably correct. But may it not be that reason has a broader province than is here assigned her? Using the term in the comprehensive sense in which President Milligan evidently uses it, and I incline to think so. To illustrate what I mean, let us take the proposition, the book of Genesis is evidenced to us as divinely inspired. The

premises which warrant this conclusion must be furnished to hand. Previous to this, reason comes not into play. But the premises being given, then reason draws the conclusion. Is not this too much restricting reason? May it not be as much her province to *discover* the data which necessitate the conclusion, as to draw the conclusion when the data are given? Hardly will the question be negatived. But even here the President would doubtless say that we reach the ultimate data from which our conclusion results by a process of inferring—inferring the true from the false data. This is certainly correct; and with this single qualification, his position seems to be invulnerable.

There is, however, another province of reason to which attention is here invited, or if not a province, something so closely resembling it that it is not easy to discriminate between them. In all minds there is the notion or feeling, I am not concerned about the name, of love, of right, of kindness, of gratitude, of wrong. How we come by these notions is here no question. As a simple matter of fact, we know we have them. We can not define them; for they are original, irresolvable, and hence do not admit of it. Now the province to which I allude is this: in all questions involving the relations and duties of man to man, our reason intuitively perceives that the teachings and requisitions of Holy Writ complement and satisfy these notions. We thus in ourselves have the evidence that the teachings are right. Not only so, but we feel that it would be impossible to convince us that they are not right. Were even an unfallen angel to announce to us that we are mistaken, our conviction would remain the same.

Besides, there is still another end which reason subserves, unless my inner perceptions be much at fault. On inspecting our natures, especially our spiritual natures, there are at once discoverable certain great abiding wants, for the gratification of which nature clearly makes no provision. These wants are the most absorbing and important which inhere in humanity. They are life-long, ever pressing their claims, but without success. I am conscious, for example, that I want to live, to live on, and still on forever; that I want to live a life whose conditions greatly differ from those of the present life; that I want to live in my body, and not out of it, but in a body wholly exempt from infirmities; that I want to live a life of sinless purity; that I want to be free from pain, and to know that I am never to die; that I want to be free from toil and fear and care; that I want to be always learning and never forgetting; that I want to live in the society of men and women who are holy and happy, like myself; that I want to see God and Christ, and to be loved by them,—these are some of the great wants under the weight of which I daily groan. Now in all the universe of God, viewed from a natural point, I see no provision made to meet these wants. In Christianity

alone is provision made for them. This my reason unmistakably perceives. Is this done by any logical process? Does not my mind rather perceive it, as I perceive the truth of an intuition? It is something I at once and directly see or feel, and not a conclusion I reach by a process of reasoning. I hardly think this can be successfully questioned.

But is not even this in perfect harmony with the President's theory of the true province of reason? I believe it is. Certainly it implies a long series of comparisons, and this is one of the very acts which he predicates of reason. I compare my wants with the provisions of Christianity, and study the perfect and inimitable adaptation of these to those. The conviction is immediately felt that these provisions were *intended* for those wants. Who, I at once ask, can be the author of this intention. In my soul I feel that it can not be man. Then I conclude it must be God. This is certainly a train of reasoning. But I hardly think this the original mental process. It is rather the after statement thereof; or it is that process re-cast or re-constructed. The original process seems to me to partake more of the nature of intuition than of ratiocination. Still, I shall not insist on it; especially I shall not urge it as differing from President Milligan.

But this I must add, that it is precisely the fact that these provisions are felt to rise above the human, and to be so perfectly adapted to our deepest and grandest wants, that makes us so ready to accept the Christian religion as true, as from God. But for this, I do not believe the sublimest logic human ingenuity is capable of constructing could ever induce one man to receive as true the fact of a divine revelation. It is, moreover, the circumstance I am now considering, more than all others besides, which baffles the efforts of skeptics and infidels. As long as man has a heart to feel and deep spiritual wants which cry within him, and as long as Christianity speaks to that heart and provides for those wants, infidels may talk on, and their talk is *nil*. Human nature does not ask for an elaborate demonstration that the gospel is true; human nature carries in itself, in its perceptions and feelings, about the only proof it asks. God does not speak to man and leave logic to decide the fact that he has spoken. In the very act of speaking he causes the soul to recognize the fact that it is he who speaks. Therefore the soul refuses to doubt it. This, of course, is not said of the perverted, but only of the unperverted soul. Only when in his normal state does the proof arise to man of which I am speaking. Give me this one single circumstance on the one hand, and place over against it all the arguments, sound or the reverse, ever urged by infidels, and I will still carry ninety per cent. of all the human family for Christ. This assertion is to be held as true only in the light of the sentence which precedes it.

After stating most clearly the province which he assigns to reason, President M. then proceeds to details and specific applications. The very first question on which he most justly allows it proper that human reason should be employed, is that of the authenticity and truth of the Holy Scriptures. On this point he thus speaks :

“ And hence” (too many sentences in the President’s book begin with *and*) “ it is obvious that her relations to divine revelation are most intimate and important. The very first question that naturally arises in the mind of every man concerning the Bible respects its origin. Is it of human, or is it of divine origin ? Is it the word of man’s wisdom, or is it, as it claims to be, the word of the living God ? To answer this question, therefore, on the ground of all the evidence variously furnished, is the first province of reason in matters pertaining to divine revelation.

Accordingly, after this, President M. proceeds to discuss, in one hundred and thirty-seven pages, the “ Divine Origin of the Bible.” No student can fail to be profited by this discussion. As an argument, I think it not exceeding the bounds of sober truth to say it is conclusive. It is one of the very best in print. It evinces all the research and thought necessary to entitle it to the respect of the scholar ; while to the young preacher who may be without an ample library, as well as without the leisure for long consecutive thought, it is wholly invaluable. My young brethren should be as familiar with it as with their alphabet. Its contents should be thoroughly mastered, and all its references fully consulted. Had President M. done nothing more than produce this single discussion, all young preachers would have owed him a debt of deep gratitude. I wish it were in my power to furnish excerpts from it which could give an adequate idea of it without at the same time doing it injustice. But it is not. In fragments it could not be appreciated. It must be read and studied as a whole. Nothing less would be just to the book, or just to the reader.

In Part Second, the Canon of the Holy Scriptures is treated in fifty-nine pages. Here also the Bible student will find brought together in a very short compass a large amount of most valuable information. Possibly, by some, this part of the book, as also Part Third, may be thought to be too much condensed. This, however, grows wholly out of the fact that the author’s limits allowed him no more space. The subject, fully treated, would fill a volume. All has been done for it that could in so short a compass.

On the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures the book speaks at some length. The topic is important, and deserves, I think, a more exhausting handling than it has here received. Of the various *theories* of inspiration, President M. presents us with four. Three of these he denominates “ false,” the fourth, “ true.” The former are as follows :

"I.—The first of these is commonly called *The Mechanical Theory of Inspiration*. According to this theory, the writers of the Bible were all the mere passive instruments or penmen of the Holy Spirit ; or, at any rate, they did nothing more than act as the mere amanuenses of the Spirit. They are supposed to have merely recorded the words and ideas of the Spirit, just as Tertius recorded the words and ideas of Paul in his Epistle to the Romans.

"II.—Next in order is *The Theory of Natural Inspiration*. This admits of a great many different grades and shades of meaning. Some make it consist wholly in the natural influence of the subject on the powers and susceptibilities of the human mind ; while others concede that it includes also some degree of providential influence. But all of this school seem to think that the inspiration of Isaiah differs but little from that of Homer ; and that the inspiration of Paul was essentially the same in kind as that of Demosthenes.

"III.—Others again attempt to occupy medium ground on this subject. They concede that the thoughts were all suggested by the Holy Spirit ; but they insist that, in all cases, the writers were left to express their thoughts in words of their own choice. This, for the sake of distinction, may be called *The Næmational Theory of Inspiration*."

Against these three several theories President M. files briefly his objections. These objections, with a few qualifications, I think good, at least against the second and third theories. Indeed, the second is, in fact, no theory of *inspiration* at all. It is simply the negative of all inspiration, in the strict sense of the term. It hence does not deserve to be called a theory of *inspiration*. It is the denial of inspiration, and not a theory of it. It is simply the form in which Newman and others see fit to give expression to their repudiation of the Bible.

I am not sure that President M. is right in denominating the third theory "false." To me it seems not wholly false, but only so in part. In so far as it concedes that "the thoughts were all suggested by the Holy Spirit," it is surely right. It is only wrong in maintaining that these thoughts were left to be expressed in words of unaided human choice. It could be very aptly phrased the *theory of partial inspiration*.

As worded by President M., I would certainly not assume to defend the first theory. The word "*mechanical*," in his view of the theory, is certainly correct ; but I incline to think its only effect is to prejudice a theory which, with proper qualifications, may be shown to fall not far from the true one. The word inspire means *to breathe into* ; and in the question of revelation primarily signifies that the Holy Spirit furnished the ancient inspired writers and speakers the thoughts, ideas, and facts which constitute the matter of revelation. This matter consists of things done on earth, and of things revealed

from heaven. In regard to the former, the Spirit brought them to mind where they had not been witnessed, and kept them in mind where they had ; in regard to the latter, it revealed them strictly. Moreover, the words in which these things were enounced, we are expressly told by Paul, were taught by the Holy Spirit. This makes the Holy Spirit the author of both the *matter* and *language* of revelation. Such a theory I would denominate, using English instead of Greek words, *The Thought-and-Word Theory of Inspiration*. The word plenary is the one, I believe, in common use ; but in itself it is not sufficiently definite, and is hence objectionable.

The objection which President M. urges against this theory is thus stated by him : "The Mechanical Theory fails to account for the *human element* that is so very prominent in all the sacred writings of both the Old and the New Testament." There is, then, a *human element* in both Old Testament and New. Now, were I opposing President M's. book, which I certainly am not, or were I debating the point with him, I should unquestionably deny this assertion, and thus devolve on him the proof of its truth. I am far from meaning to imply that he would not be equal to the task ; only I could not allow him to assume so vital a point.

There is something we call the matter of the Bible—its thoughts, ideas, facts, truths, in a word, its sense or meaning ; then there is its language. Now the question is, who compiled these into the several books in which we find them ? Is this wholly the work of the Spirit through men ; or is it, in any sense, or to any extent, the work of men simply as men ? If the former, then the Book is certainly divine ; but if the latter, it is only partly so. Then, in this case, what guarantee have we that the Book is free from error in the part which is of men simply as men ?

But how shall we account for the *human element* of the Book, conceding that it contains one ? Precisely thus, it seems to me : The Spirit spoke and wrote through John, through Peter, through Paul. But in writing and speaking through John, it did not write and speak as the Spirit, but as John ; that is, it said through John the things which it wrote and spoke precisely as John himself would have said them, could he have done so, or had he done so, without the Spirit. John writes and speaks *naturally* as John, but when speaking and writing on things above him and beyond him, he does so *naturally*, because the Spirit enables him to do it. This would give to his writings that naturalness which would make them seem to be simply the writings of John, while in fact they were those of the Spirit. Thus they would seem to have a *human element*, while in reality they had none. When the mercury stands at ninety degrees in the tube, it stands there as naturally as when it stands at one ; yet it can not stand at ninety without aid. So when John wrote of things above

him, he wrote as naturally as though he had been writing of the commonest event of every-day life ; still he did this by aid of the Spirit. What is here said of John is, of course, to be held as true of all the inspired writers. Thus the idiosyncrasy of each writer would remain uninterfered with, and would hence stand out in his writings. Paul, though writing wholly, that is, both as to matter and words, by the Holy Spirit, would still seem to write wholly as Paul. Hence the same differences would appear in their writings which existed among them as men ; and yet all being moved by the same Spirit, their writings would constitute one symmetrical whole. We should thus have diversity in unity, and unity notwithstanding diversity. Only one thing more I shall here add : the subject, as justly remarked by President M., is difficult, and should be touched with caution and extreme modesty. It is not the field for a dogmatic spirit.

But I must now present the whole of what President M. says under the heading, "*The True Theory of Inspiration.*" His language is as follows :

"From the premises now submitted, it will not be difficult to state in few words the True Theory of Inspiration, so far as the subject can be understood by our finite reason. The following propositions embrace all that it is really necessary we should understand on this very interesting but difficult subject:

"I.—It is evident that *the Holy Spirit exercised a very special providential and miraculous influence over both the words and thoughts of the Old and New Testament writers.* The proof of this proposition has already been stated with sufficient fullness.

"II.—But as God never employs unnecessary means in any case; as he never exercises his power providentially when existing natural means are adequate to the end proposed ; nor miraculously when natural and providential means are sufficient for his purpose, it follows, in the second place, that in making the Bible what it ought to be, *he used all the learning and talents of the several writers that composed it, so far as these natural means could be made available ;* just as he used the forces of nature in producing the Noahic deluge, and as Christ used the five loaves and two fishes in feeding five thousand men. And hence we see that, in one sense, every word and every thought of the entire Bible is of God; and in another and subordinate sense, that every word and every thought of the Bible is also of man; and, consequently, that the divine and the human elements coexist in all parts of the Sacred Scriptures.

"III.—On the same principle of divine economy, it also follows, that *an equal degree of inspiration was not always necessary in every case.* To qualify Moses or Paul to reveal the future, or to develop, either in type or in fact, the mysteries of redemption, would seem to require a much higher degree of divine inspiration than that which

was necessary in order to enable him to record unerringly those facts that fall under his own immediate observation.

"In both cases, the miraculous aid of the Holy Spirit was indispensable. Without this, no man would have been able to decide infallibly what should and what should not be recorded; what degree of prominence should be given to one event, and what to another. Who of us, for instance, if left to the guidance of our own erring reason, would ever think of recording the historical events and statistics of the Books of Kings and Chronicles, in preference to the discourses that Christ delivered to the two disciples, on his way to Emmaus, on the day of his resurrection; or the discourse of Paul, to which Luke merely refers in the last chapter of Acts? Manifestly, the miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit was absolutely necessary in all cases and under all circumstances; but not, I think, in the same degree and to the same extent; if, indeed, we are at all competent to judge of such matters. Here, as in the ordinary affairs of life, human instrumentality seems to have been employed just so far as it could be used to advantage. But above and beyond all this, the Holy Spirit was ever present, exerting his miraculous power and influence, so as to reveal the whole truth, suppress every error, and, in a word, to make such a book as would, in every respect, be perfectly adapted to all the wants and circumstances of mankind. This much was absolutely necessary; and anything more than this would have been superfluous.

"IV.—And hence it follows, finally, that *there are no real discrepancies, contradictions, nor errors of any kind in the original Scriptures.* Barring the few remaining unimportant mistakes that have been introduced into the Bible by uninspired transcribers, it is, like its divine Author, infinitely perfect, and without even a blemish of any kind."

Such, in President M.'s sober judgment, is the true *theory* of inspiration. On it, since the reader will form his own opinion, I shall refrain from comment. The importance of the subject demanded that I should lay the entire piece before the reader. By this means he will not only learn what the President's theory is in the case, but also what his skill and ability are in handling the various topics of which he treats.

With one more extract, I must close this notice of this safe and excellent book. On the "*last and highest function of reason,*" President M. thus speaks:

"The last, and perhaps I might say the highest, function of reason in matters pertaining to divine revelation, is *to cordially and fully acquiesce in the fitness, the wisdom, and the correctness of whatever God has clearly revealed.* His authority is supreme. From it there is no appeal. And hence, to refuse to submit to it in any case, and under any circumstances, is most irrational and absurd.

"If reason is not fully satisfied with the entire chain of evidence, she may re-examine it. She may, if she pleases, again consider each of the questions, whether the Bible is the word of God; whether it is the pure word of God; whether it is the pure and inspired word of God; whether the principles of interpretation are all founded in truth; and, finally, she may examine and see with the most rigid and scrutinizing exactness, whether the rules and principles have all been correctly and judiciously applied in the course of the exegesis. But all these points having been found correct, and having been conceded, then, indeed, *reason has no alternative left but to cordially and fully acquiesce in the truthfulness and paramount authority of every oracle that bears the seal and stamp of God's own inspiration.*

"We have no right to reject it on the ground that we can not comprehend it; or that we can not reconcile it with our preconceived notions and opinions. No sane man so reasons in any other department of knowledge, science, and literature. On the contrary, we all receive *as facts*, in other branches of learning, many things that we do not and that we can not comprehend. We believe, for instance, that the sun holds the earth in its orbit, and regulates its motions; but does any living astronomer profess to comprehend fully the philosophy of these phenomena? We believe that food received into the stomach is converted into all the various cells and tissues of the body; but does any physiologist, however learned, presume to understand fully and perfectly these mysterious processes? We feel perfectly sure that the soul dwells within the body, as its clay tabernacle, that it preserves it, moves it, gives tone, energy, beauty, and vitality to it; but has any metaphysician ever pretended to explain how it accomplishes all these results? These, and ten thousand other phenomena equally mysterious, are now received *as facts* by every man of ordinary intelligence; not because we fully understand them, but simply because no one can any longer reasonably doubt the evidence of their reality.

"And just so it is with respect to many things contained in the Holy Bible. No philosopher can explain them; but even the child may, on the evidence submitted, believe and receive them as the real and veritable oracles of that Spirit which searches all things, yea, even the deep counsels and purposes of Jehovah."

Numerous are the passages in President Milligan's book which I should like to transcribe for the pleasure of the reader, did my limits permit. But with these, as already said, I must confide it to an appreciating public. I only regret that it is not in my power to commend it to the American people in such manner as to insure for it a reading at the hands of all my countrymen. For its own sake it is entitled to this honor. Here is a book which can injure the heart of none; but which must ennoble all who will carefully read it. In the

minds of all, must esteem for the Bible increase as its pages are turned over. This is its high merit. It is designed to place deep in the affections of the reader, the holy volume in whose defense it is written. It embodies the wisdom and faith of an amiable Christian gentleman, of large experience and much thought. It is his legacy to the youth of his country. My profound wish is, that his benevolent heart may not have wrought on it to no effect. In thousands and tens of thousands let it be circulated over the land. Unread, it can be of no value. See to it, then, brethren, that wherever infidelity is possible, this book goes.

ROMANISM AND THE CONFESSIONAL.

MAN in the place of God, and the Church in the place of the Bible, is the very essence and soul of popery. What, then, is the exaltation of man to the position of God but idolatry? The chief distinctive element of popery is, therefore, idolatry. Of course, Rome pleads "Not Guilty," and endeavors to throw dust in our eyes, by talking learned nonsense about different kinds of worship. But to say nothing of the worship of the wafer in, what Rome calls, the most holy sacrament, with the worship of *latria*, which she says is due to the true God, it is undeniably certain that man is worshiped as God alone should be. But, when pressed, the Romanist replies "that he *only prays to saints that they may pray for him.*" This, however, is plainly untrue; yet, were it true, it would be bad enough. It is false, because their own books supply forms of prayer which show the contrary, as for instance: "O Holy Mother of God, help my frailty and weakness; assist me this day in all my calamities, temptations, and dangers, but especially at the hour of my death, vouchsafe not to depart from me, that by thy prayers and protection I may be safe." And again: "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul. Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I breathe forth my soul to you in peace?"

But the most appalling proof of this gross idolatry is seen in *The Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, a work which Bellarmine ascribes to St. Bonaventura, and which is contained in the works of that, so-called, saint, published at Rome by order of Pope Sixtus V. To behold the way in which the Bible has been ransacked for the purpose of taking out of it the loftiest ascriptions of praise and adoration, and transferring them to the honored Mary is almost enough to make one's blood curdle. A few instances must suffice:

"Lady, how are they increased that trouble me; in thy wrath shalt thou persecute and scatter them.

"Loosen the bonds of our iniquity; remove the burden of our sins.

"Have mercy upon me, O Lady, and heal my infirmity; take away the pain and anguish of my heart.

"Deliver me not over unto my enemies; but support my soul in the day of my death.

"Thou hast heard me when I called, O Lady; and from thy throne on high thou hast vouchsafed to remember me.

"For thy mercy and tenderness is beneficent to all those that call upon thy sacred name.

"Blessed be thou, O Lady, forever, and thy majesty throughout all ages.

"Glorify her, all ye Gentiles, in your strength; and all ye people of the world extol her grandeur. Glory, etc.

"The heavens declare thy glory; and the perfume of thine ointments is diffused among the nations.

"Hear us, Lady, in the day of trouble; and turn thy merciful countenance to our prayers.

"In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust; let me never be put to confusion; in thy grace uphold me.

"Have mercy upon me, O Lady; who art called the mother of mercy.

"And according to the bowels of thy mercies; *cleanse me from all my iniquities.*

"*Pour out thy grace upon me;* and take not thy wonted loving-kindness from me.

"O come, let us worship and fall down before her; let us confess our sins unto her with tears.

"The Lord said unto our Lady: Sit, mother, on my right hand.

"He that shall worthily worship her shall be justified; but he that shall neglect her, shall die in his sins.

"O praise our Lady from the heavens; praise her in the heights.

"Praise her, all ye men and beasts; fowls of the heaven and the fishes of the sea.

"Praise her, Sun and Moon; Stars and orbits of the planets.

"Praise her, Cherubim and Seraphim; Thrones and Dominions and Powers.

"Praise her, all ye legions of Angels; praise her, all ye orders of spirits above. Glory, etc.

"*O praise the Lady in her holiness; praise her in her powers and miracles.*

"Praise her, company of the Apostles; praise her, choirs of Patriarchs and Prophets.

"Praise her, ye armies of Martyrs; praise her, ye hosts of Doctors and Confessors.

"Praise her in the College of Virgins and Chaste ones; praise her, ye orders of Anchorites and Monks.

"Praise her, ye societies of all religious men; praise her, all ye souls of the citizens above.

"*Let everything that hath breath:—praise our Lady. Gloria, etc.*"

From THE SPECULUM B. V. M., we give the following :

"After all that has been said we are to consider that Mary is interpreted Lady (i. e., Ruler, answering to Lord). This title also excellently suits so great an Empress, who is in truth ruler of things in heaven, in earth, and under the earth. Ruler, I say, of Angels, Ruler of men, Ruler of Demons, Ruler of each in heaven, Ruler in the world. Ruler in hell,"

If this is not giving the creature the honor and worship due to God alone, can any one say in what words that worship could be rendered. One would think this sample almost enough to satisfy those pre-millennialists who tell us that the Man of Sin has not yet appeared, unless indeed Louis Napoleon be he, because the papacy has never exalted man above all that is called God or that is worshipped.

But not only do Romanists put dead saints in the place of God, but they deify living men; in this world, as in the other, MAN is put in the place of God. Passing the fact that the canon law says that "the

Pope, who is called God, can neither be bound nor loosed by any secular power, for it is evident that a God can not be judged by men," we observe that even the common priest in certain positions is deified. The *Protestant Electoral Union* has brought itself into questionable fame by the recent publication of a pamphlet entitled *The Confessional Unmasked*. This publication has been condemned under Lord Campbell's Act for preventing the sale of obscene and indecent literature. But upon taking the case to a higher court, the decision was reversed on the ground that though the book is filthy in the extreme, it was not sold for immoral purposes, and therefore it is now freely sold. This pamphlet is a fair translation of passages in the class-books of Maynooth College, there used to instruct priests in the duties of the Confessional, to which college our Government hands over some £30,000 annually, thus compelling the nation to support a system of education which includes instruction too filthy to be left in the way of any woman, single or married, and which modest men could hardly, if at all, read to each other. Of course, the exposure has raised some amount of feeling against the priests. The subject is treated as though the thing existed from a liking for the unclean. But the simple truth is, that it is an absolutely necessary adjunct to placing man in the room of God. To understand this, we must know what the priest in the confessional is declared to be. There he is no mere man, no mere priest, hearing confession, and giving, in the name of God, absolution, but he is God. In the confessional, every priest assumes, not only the prerogatives and power of God, but also the name of God. The proof we give from class-books of Maynooth :

NOTE 1.—"If a priest be asked by a magistrate concerning those things of which he has knowledge only from confession, he ought to answer that he does not know them, yea, indeed, *to swear it*, without any danger of a lie. The reason is, according to *Estius*, that he neither lies nor speaks equivocally, who answers according to the mind of the person inquiring, and utters nothing but the truth; and thus it is with the priest in the case aforesaid, for the judge does not inquire of him what he knows by means of confession, WHERE HE ACTS IN THE PLACE OF GOD, but what he may know *as man*, and therefore apart from confession. All theologians agree with *Estius*."

No. 159.—"Concerning the Seal of Confession.

"What is the seal of sacramental confession?

"A. It is the obligation of concealing those things which are learned from sacramental confession.

No. 160.—"Concerning the breaking of the sacramental seal?

"Can a case be given in which it is lawful to break the sacramental seal?

"A. No, it can not, though the safety or life of a man, or even the ruin of the state might depend thereon; nor can the Pope himself dispense herein: inasmuch as this secret of the seal is more binding than the obligation of an oath, a vow, a natural secret, etc.; and that from the positive will of God.

"What answer, then, ought a confessor to make, when asked about the truth which he knows only from sacramental confession?

"A. He ought to say, he *does not know it*, and, if it be necessary, confirm it with an oath!!

"Objection. It is in no case lawful to tell a lie, but a confessor so speaking would lie, because he knows the truth; therefore, etc.

"A. I deny the minor" (that is, that the priest would be guilty of a lie). "For such a confessor is asked as a man, and he answers as a man; but he does not know that truth as a man, though he *knows* it as God!! says St. Thomas Aquinas; and that meaning is included in the answer; for when he is questioned, or answers, out of confession, he is regarded as a man!!"

Now the confession of sin, not in the general, but in detail, is a divine requirement. God demands it in order to absolution. But then, excepting sins against individuals, which should be confessed to the persons sinned against, the required confession is to God alone. Not that the sinner is required to put into word every sinful thought and deed, repeat and count them over in the ear of God. Confession, like prayer, may be *uttered* or *unexpressed*, but it must be there, present to the mind of the sinner. In his, it may be soundless, confession to God, must he, in mind, go down again to the bottom of the unclean pit of his sins, not in delight, as when he committed them, but in abhorrence of soul; and thus spreading them out to his own view and to God's, he comes into the position referred to by the apostle John: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." But put man in the place of God, as is done in the confessional, and it follows that that man must have the every sin put into words—he can know it in no other way. Thus the confessor into whose ear the multitude pour all their uncleanness of thought, word, and deed becomes a walking cesspool. When you remember that many of these priests are young, and all unmarried, what can be your estimate of the effect upon his own inner life? We have no inclination to deal out wholesale denunciation, as though every priest, under these circumstances, is and must be a man of pollution. We believe that there are those who rise above the horrid position in which they are placed, and walk in personal purity; but they are few in number, and they escape by leaving undone much that the instruction they receive requires them to perform.

That the deepest, direst revelation of thought and deed—that the foulest conceptions and acts should force themselves in words from prostrate men and women, whose faces burn with shame as they utter them—is not to be wondered at; for they who go to confession believe in it, and so believing, see but two evils to choose from—HELL or COMPLETE CONFESSION. They are taught that not only is the unconfessed sin unforgiven, but that the absolution pronounced in reference to other sins is invalid. Here is teaching upon confession:

"*Concealment of sins.*—If you remember a mortal sin, must you confess it?

"Yes.

"If you do not confess a mortal sin because you are ashamed, will it be forgiven?

"No.

"Will the other sins you tell in that confession be forgiven?

"No.

"Why will not the other sins be forgiven?

"Because it is a bad confession.

"If a person has willfully concealed a mortal sin in confession, can he get it forgiven?"

"Yes.

"How can he get it forgiven?"

"By confessing it.

"Must he tell that he concealed it?"

"Yes.

"Must he tell all the sins of that confession over again?"

"Yes.

"Why must he tell them over again?"

"Because they were not forgiven."

This is the undeviating law of confession; and thus the deepest recesses of the soul are open to the priest, whatever they may contain. The pages published to instruct the young in this matter contain also examples of the fearful results of concealing even one sin. Here is an instance:

"A child went to the altar to receive the Holy Communion. Nobody could see any difference betwixt it and the other children. It came back and knelt down in its place for a few moments, when it fell down on the floor. They carried the poor child out of the chapel to a house, but they found its eyes were shut, and it could not speak. The doctor was sent for, but he could not tell what was the matter with it. The priest went over to the house and looked into its face, and spoke to it. But the child made no answer, and seemed to have no sense. The priest stood there wondering what could be the matter with the child. All at once the child opened its eyes and said: 'I made a bad confession this morning. When I went to confession there was a great sin which I was frightened to tell, and I would not tell it.' As soon as the child had said these words, it turned round and died. Then, for the love of Jesus, tell your sins in confession."

The confessional, then, exists because man is exalted to the place of God. So long as the priest takes the power and name of God, so long will the confessional exist, and so long will it be necessary to instruct priests in all the conceivable transactions of darkness to which men and women can descend, that he may know what does and what does not require absolution, and so long must all the filth be poured into his open and watchful ear. To destroy the confessional you must overturn the idolatry of Rome, and this will never be done by those who divide Christians into priests and laymen. Remarks on Protestantism must stand for another opportunity. D. KING.

"DO ALL TO THE GLORY OF GOD."

Something for Jesus! Oh, for his dear sake
The brightest hopes and sweetest joys forsake
Counting with gladness every pang and smart
That binds thee closer to his bleeding heart.

Something for Jesus! Let the words entwine
With every action, every word of thine;
For 'e'en thy daily thoughts, if brought to him,
Will be accepted as an offering.

Something for Jesus! As the stone of old,
It toucheth common life with threads of gold,
Bright'ning the lonely path of grief and care,
And giving life an aim—to do, to bear.

Something for Jesus! See, the words expand!
As touched with meaning by a Master hand;
And new-born light reveals the secret power
Of every moment, every passing hour.

Something for Jesus! Nothing is too small,
Nothing too great to give when he gave all;
And simple service done as in his sight,
Grows every day in length, and breadth, and height.

Something for Jesus! Lord, I long to be
A living song of gratitude to thee—
A guiding light, a hand stretched forth to bless,
A spirit covered with Christ's righteousness.

—*Parish Visitor.*



